

R. Shannon, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Franklin Desk Company, of Franklin, Ind., in favor of bill H. R. 9302, to place alcohol used for industrial purposes on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Resolution of J. G. Shackleton Post, No. 83, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Jersey, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., asking for an increase in the depth of the main ship channel giving access to the port of Baltimore from 30 to 35 feet depth of water at mean low tide—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Resolutions of Bosworth Post, No. 2, of Portland, Me., and of Edwin Libbey Post, No. 16, of Rockland, Me., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY: Petitions of vessel owners, fishermen, and others of Boston and Gloucester, asking the Government to offer a sufficient bounty on dogfish to insure their extermination—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of trustees of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church, of Ringgold, Ga., praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, that unallotted lands tributary to Devils Lake Indian Reservation be opened to settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, that unallotted lands tributary to Devils Lake Indian Reservation be opened to settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of James P. Moore, praying reference of claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: Resolutions of G. W. Trafton Post, No. 239, of Knoxville, Ill., and of Joe Hooker Post, No. 69, of Canton, Ill., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolutions of Edwin D. Lowe Post, No. 295, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jerseyville, Ill., favoring the enactment of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODEY: Resolution of Aztec Post, No. 15, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New Mexico, in favor of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Memorial to accompany bill providing for a public building at Denver, Colo.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of the Sons of Hermann and the Farmers' Club of Shovel Mount, Tex., in opposition to the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Papers to accompany bill for war claim of the Baptist Church of Columbia, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: Petition of Statelick (Pa.) Epworth League, praying for the passage of the McCumber, Hepburn-Dolliver, Humphreys, and Dryden bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNOOK: Resolutions of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring international arbitration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the South Side Business and Improvement Association, favoring a new Federal judicial district for central Ohio, with court located at Columbus, Ohio, and favoring an appropriation to enlarge the Government building at Columbus, Ohio—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOUTHALL: Memorial to accompany bill for the relief of Francis S. Nash—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: Petition of Admiral Farragut Garrison, No. 25, of Albany, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 3586—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of B. B. Richardson and 67 others, of Drayton, N. Dak., in favor of the passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of citizens of Fargo, N. Dak., relative to navigation of Red River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Wiley Franks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill relating to the Payton Tate pension claim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Mrs. Parley—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of William Mayers, of

Marshall County, Miss.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Letter of the American Trading Company, of New York City, indorsing the Lodge bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, for improvement of main ship channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, letter of Edward A. Bond, of Albany, N. Y., in favor of bill H. R. 4508—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Sac City, Iowa, favoring the passage of bills H. R. 4072 and S. 1390—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of P. P. Adams and others, of Waltham, Mass., for the payment of a bounty by the United States for the extermination of dogfish and the establishing of fertilizer and oil works on the Atlantic coast—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WADE: Resolution of Albert Winchell Post, No. 327, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lyons, Iowa, in favor of a service-pension law—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNOCK: Resolutions of Harry Davis Post, No. 612, Grand Army of the Republic, of Woodstock, Ohio, urging the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic posts of Wayne City, Grayville, West Salem, Albion, and Louisville, Ill., urging the passage of a service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 21, 1904.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BEVERIDGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the Journal will stand approved. It is approved.

HEIRS OF STEPHEN STALEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of William B. Staley, Ellen R. Whitson, and Robert D. Staley, sole heirs of Stephen Staley, deceased, v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6295) for preventing the adulteration or misbranding of food or drugs, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a memorial of the Grays Harbor Trades and Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Aberdeen, Wash., remonstrating against the reenactment of the law authorizing the payment of allotment in the coastwise trade; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry ministers of Seattle and of sundry citizens of Seattle and Waitsburg, all in the State of Washington, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Christian Church of Waitsburg, of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Everett, and of the congregation of the United Presbyterian Church of Waitsburg, all in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the Sunday closing of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition; which were referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Centralia, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made in aid of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the removal or destruction of derelicts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made for the protection of the harbor of Hi'o and for the improvement of

the entrance to the harbor at Honolulu, Hawaii; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Second Presbyterian Church of San Jose; of the congregation of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Oakland; of the congregation of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of Berkeley; of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Oakland; of the congregation of the Brooklyn Presbyterian Church, of Oakland; of the congregation of the Tenth Avenue Baptist Church, of Oakland; of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oakland; of the congregation of the Plymouth Avenue Congregational Church, of Oakland; of the congregation of the Thirty-fourth Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Oakland; of the Chester Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Oakland; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Oakland, and of sundry citizens of Hemet, all in the State of California, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Milford, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Milford, and of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Congregational Church of Milford, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of the congregation of the Universalist Church of Woodstock, of the congregation of the Christian Church of Woodstock, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chittenden County, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Retail Grocers' Association of Danville, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Calumet Joint Labor Council, American Federation of Labor, of Kensington, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called eight-hour bill and also the anti-injunction bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of Seward Nelson Post, No. 251, of Wapella; of Thomas Riddle Post, No. 230, of Leroy; of Randall Post, No. 568, of Trenton; of W. W. Burnett Post, No. 537, of Eldorado; of Millstadt Post, No. 684, of Millstadt; of P. Schooley Post, No. 418, of Watson; of S. T. Rogers Post, No. 531, of El Paso; of Will Enderton Post, No. 729, of Rock Falls; of Fred O. Spooner Post, No. 294, of Argenta, and of Joe Hooker Post, No. 69, of Canton, all of the Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to regulate and control corporations and combinations that monopolize and restrain trade; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to revise the fees and salaries of all Federal officers; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the foreign markets for American agricultural products; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the use of shoddy; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to require all laws to be approved by a vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of United

States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the public highways of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a deep waterway or ship canal connecting the Mississippi River with the Great Lakes and thence to the Atlantic seaboard; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship-subsidy bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit railroad companies from exacting higher rates for carrying the United States mails than for the transportation of freight by express companies; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish postal savings banks; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Illinois, Patrons of Husbandry, of Dunlap, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salary of rural mail carriers from \$600 to \$800 per annum; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Martinsburg, W. Va., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lake Pleasant, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Presbyterian Church of State Lick, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes and all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia; of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Kittanning; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greensburg; of the St. Paul's League, of Lancaster; of the Brown Chapel Christian Endeavor Society, of Allegheny; of the Civic Club, of Carlisle; of the congregation of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Lancaster, and of the National Union of Women's Organizations, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Rivera, Lincoln, San Francisco, Wildomar, Lemon Grove, Santa Ana, Success, Alpine, Riverside, Redlands, Bostonia, Hanford, Ramona, San Jose, Vacaville, Watsonville, Cupertino, and Fresno, all in the State of California, and of Marion, Oreg., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the Northern California Indian Association, praying that Government lands be allotted to the Indians of the northern part of the State of California, who are now not in the possession of any land; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. LONG presented the affidavit of James K. Oliver, of Stafford County, Kans., in support of the bill (S. 2872) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Schermerhorn; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the National Congress of Mothers and a petition of the National Union of Woman's Organizations, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. CLAPP presented petitions of Post No. 147, of Park Rapids; of B. F. Sweet Post, No. 149; of Money Creek Post, No. 182, and of Ransom Post, No. 165, all of the Department of Minnesota,

Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Stonington, Conn., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Connecticut Horticultural Society, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the Calaveras groves of *Sequoia gigantea* in California; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented the petition of Rev. R. E. Smith and sundry other citizens of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of the Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition; which was referred to the Select Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Mr. McCOMAS presented a petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Maryland, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, Md., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for Government inspection of grain; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Admiral John Rodgers Post, No. 28, of Havre de Grace; of Pickett Post, No. 17, of Winfield, and of Burns Post, No. 13, of Westminster, all of the Department of Maryland, Grand Army of the Republic, in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of Phil Sheridan Post, No. 88, Department of Kansas, Grand Army of the Republic, of Clay Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of a service-pension law; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Garnett, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect prohibition States and districts against "original-package" tricks; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions of the Waupun Study Club, of Waupun; of the Monday Afternoon Club, of Ottawa, and of the congregation of the Church of Christ of Tedrow, all in the State of Maine, and of the Woman's Missionary Society of Wabash, Ind., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented petitions of the Christian Civic League of Farmington, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent nullification of State liquor laws and no-license ordinances by so-called "original-package" and other "interstate-commerce" tricks; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Civic League of Farmington, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FULTON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2516) for the relief of Nye & Schneider Company, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2560) for the relief of G. G. Martin, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 114) to extend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885, relative to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3424) to authorize the removal of structures from Indian allotments in Minnesota, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 3658) ratifying an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Oklahoma legalizing the waterworks bond election held by the city of Geary, in said Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 3659) granting an increase of pension to Anslem Hobbs (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3660) granting an increase of pension to Mary Oakley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3661) granting an increase of pension to James Harris (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wilkins; and

A bill (S. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Jemima E. Johnson (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 3664) for the payment of the heirs of Porter, Harrison & Fishback for legal services; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 3665) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. O'Connor; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3666) granting an increase of pension to James W. Carrier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Orville T. Lee; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a bill (S. 3668) granting an increase of pension to George S. Howard; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MONEY introduced a bill (S. 3669) for the relief of the estate of Isham G. Bailey, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3670) for the relief of the estate of Richmond Pace, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOPKINS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3671) to correct the military record of John Alspaugh; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 3672) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish building lines; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3673) to regulate the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 3674) to pay certain Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan unpaid annuities under treaties made with them; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BURROWS. I present a memorial to accompany the bill. I move that it be printed, and that it be referred with the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington introduced a bill (S. 3675) for the relief of Robert Frost; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3676) for the relief of the estate of George W. Curtis, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3677) for the relief of George J. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3678) to provide for the creation of an additional land district in the district of Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

A bill (S. 3679) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

A bill (S. 3680) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at York, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 3681) to establish a permanent military camp ground in the Conewago Valley, in the counties of Dauphin, Lebanon, and Lancaster, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3682) to establish four permanent military camp grounds: In the vicinity of Fort Sam Houston,

Tex., Camp Douglas, Wis., in the Conewago Valley, Pennsylvania, and at or near Nacimiento Ranch, California; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 3683) to divide the northern judicial district of California into two divisions, and to provide for the holding of terms of the district court therein; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DEPEW introduced a bill (S. 3684) to place David Robertson, sergeant, first class, Hospital Corps, on the retired list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTUS introduced a bill (S. 3685) for the relief of Capt. and Bvt. Maj. Thomas H. Carpenter, United States Army, retired, or his legal representatives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 3686) granting a pension to Elhanan C. Devore; who was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. To accompany the bill I present the petition of Elhanan C. Devore, first lieutenant, Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, together with the affidavits of Dr. C. E. McBride, W. H. Haughawout, Jesse Frankenger, Stonewall Pritchett, and Thomas Hackney, and letter from the Pension Office. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 3687) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3688) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3689) granting an increase of pension to William F. McMillan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 3690) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gregory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3691) granting a pension to Nancy A. Robbs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 3692) granting a pension to Sallie E. Sperring;

A bill (S. 3693) granting an increase of pension to William T. Cooper;

A bill (S. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Fisher;

A bill (S. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Cogley;

A bill (S. 3696) granting an increase of pension to William Wright;

A bill (S. 3697) granting an increase of pension to Robert J. Henry (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3698) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Main;

A bill (S. 3699) granting an increase of pension to Edward Davidson;

A bill (S. 3700) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Litchfield;

A bill (S. 3701) granting an increase of pension to William J. Foster;

A bill (S. 3702) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Hall;

A bill (S. 3703) granting an increase of pension to Albert G. Lovell;

A bill (S. 3704) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Troxell; and

A bill (S. 3705) granting an increase of pension to George E. Henneberger.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 3706) in aid of the construction of the Valdez, Copper River and Tanana Railroad in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. BURTON introduced a bill (S. 3707) granting an increase of pension to Jane I. Clark; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 3708) for the relief of the St.

James Episcopal Church, Marietta, Ga.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 3709) to increase the efficiency and safety of the mercantile marine of the United States by creating a commission to revise the laws relating to construction, installation, and inspection of marine boilers, to provide uniformity of inspection of marine boilers in the United States and insular possessions, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3710) granting an increase of pension to Austin W. Royal; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 3711) to authorize the sale of a part of what is known as the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ELKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$60,000 for continuing and enlarging the work of the Geological Survey in examining, analyzing, and testing the coals and lignite of the United States in order to determine their fuel values, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SURVEY OF NEW MEADOWS RIVER, MAINE.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of New Meadows River, Maine, with a view to its improvement from the head of navigation to deep water in Casco Bay.

PANAMA AND THE PANAMA CANAL.

The bill (S. 3657) to acknowledge the independence of the Republic of Panama and to provide for the construction of an isthmian ship canal, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I desire to introduce into my remarks, without reading, a copy of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3657) to acknowledge the independence of the Republic of Panama and to provide for the construction of an isthmian ship canal, and for other purposes, introduced yesterday by Mr. MORGAN, is as follows:

Many nations having recognized the secession of Panama from the Republic of Colombia and its independence as an accomplished fact;

And the President of the United States having approved and protected the secession of Panama with the naval forces of the United States;

And the President and the Senate having recognized the independent Government of Panama by appointing and accrediting an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the Republic of Panama;

And the people of Panama having chosen their delegates to a constituent assembly now in session to ordain a system, plan, and constitution for the government of that Republic;

Whereby the independence of Panama has become an established fact;

Be it enacted, etc., That said Republic of Panama is annexed to the United States on the terms and conditions following:

That when this section of this act is adopted and ratified by the Government of the Republic of Panama, through the action of a constituent assembly or of the legislature of the Republic of Panama thereunto empowered, the Republic of Panama, formerly known as the Department of Panama, with its boundaries and dependencies, shall become a part of the territory of the United States and subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, and all and singular the rights and property of said Republic of Panama of every description shall vest in the United States of America without reserve, and shall be subject to their sovereign jurisdiction.

And thereupon the President of the United States shall issue his proclamation that the Republic of Panama is annexed to the United States under the provisions of this section of this act.

SEC. 2. That the sum of \$10,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, subject to the warrant of the President, as compensation to the Republic and people of Panama for the cession of its territory and rights under and in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act. Three million dollars of said sum shall be immediately available, to be used, in the discretion of the President, for the benefit of the Government of Panama, and the remaining \$7,000,000 shall be reserved in the Treasury, subject to the further disposition of the Congress of the United States, for the benefit of the people of the Republic of Panama and their respective territorial and local municipal governments.

SEC. 3. That the sum of \$15,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be subject to the warrant of the President of the United States, when Congress shall have approved and ratified any agreement the President shall make with the Republic of Colombia in respect of the secession of Panama from Colombia, including an agreement as to any public debts that Colombia may owe to other governments, which might otherwise be claimed as a debt, in whole or in part, that may be obligatory upon the Republic of Panama, and also including all rights and claims of every kind and character in favor of Colombia, in any manner or form, growing out of her relations to, or dealings or connection with, the Universal Panama Canal Company or the New Panama Canal Company.

SEC. 4. That the sum of \$40,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be applied as follows and upon the following conditions, namely:

"That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire, for and on behalf of the United States, at a cost not exceeding \$10,000,000, the rights, privileges, franchises, concessions, grants of land, right of way, unfinished work, plants, and other property, real, personal, and mixed, of every name and nature, owned by the New Panama Canal Company, of France, on

the Isthmus of Panama, and all its maps, plans, drawings, records on the Isthmus of Panama and in Paris, including all the capital stock, not less, however, than 88,863 shares, of the Panama Railroad Company, owned by or held for the use of said canal company, provided a satisfactory title to all of said property can be obtained."

And after such contract or purchase is made it shall be submitted to Congress for its ratification and shall not be finally obligatory until it is so ratified; whereupon the President is authorized to draw his warrant on the Treasury of the United States for such sum, not to exceed \$40,000,000, as Congress shall make available for such purchase.

The President shall report to Congress the terms and conditions of such purchase, and the names of the persons or corporations that are lawfully authorized and empowered to make a sale and conveyance of such property, and to receive and give acquittance for the sums of money to be paid for the property and rights of said canal companies purchased under the provisions of this section of this act.

The President shall also report to Congress the facts he may ascertain as the basis of the right of either of said Panama Canal companies to make a sale and conveyance of their property and concessionary, or other rights, to the United States, and of the state and condition of those concessions, and upon what laws or decrees of Colombia they rest for their validity.

SEC. 5. That the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the construction of an isthmian canal, in section 5 of the act approved June 28, 1902, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans," and the other provisions of said section shall apply to the construction of a canal at Panama, subject to the provisions of this act, and nothing contained in sections 2, 3, or 4 of this act shall in any manner retard or delay the construction of a canal on the Panama route, or on the Nicaraguan route, as described in said act of June 28, 1902.

Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to affect any right, power, or duty of the President, under said act of June 28, 1902, in respect of the Nicaragua route, as therein provided; or as affecting any right of the United States under the agreements, respectively, between the Republics of Nicaragua and Costa Rica and the United States, signed, sealed, and interchanged on the 1st day of December, 1900. And if a canal is constructed, or commenced to be constructed, subject to this act, at Panama, all the provisions of said act of June 28, 1902, shall apply to the same, except the first section thereof, as fully and completely as the same would have applied to a canal constructed in conformity thereto, under a treaty with Colombia, if such treaty had been made when it was the sovereign owner of the Department of Panama.

Mr. MORGAN. The resolution that I submitted yesterday is within the scope and meaning of the bill now before the Senate, and would have been incorporated in it, but it is not, in its terms, a matter that should be sent to the President for his concurrence. I will read that resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That obedience to the act of June 28, 1902, known as the "Spooner law," and the preservation and execution of the agreements between Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and the United States, entered into, sealed, and interchanged on December 1, 1900, requires that the President shall proceed to open negotiations with Nicaragua and Costa Rica for a treaty to further arrange and settle the terms, in detail, for the construction of a ship canal on the Nicaragua route.

I will not, in explaining this bill on its second reading, comment on the duty of the President as it is expressed in this resolution. My purpose is the higher one of trying to find a way to relieve the country and Congress from the embarrassment of a difficult situation into which all have been suddenly and unnecessarily plunged by events that are attracting the attention of all Christendom and are disturbing the confidence of the people in their Government to the profoundest depths.

I have no ambitious motive in presenting this measure for the consideration of this body. I only desire that good will, sincerity, justice, and success shall attend our efforts to execute the will of the people in their great mandate; that their money shall be spent wisely, honestly, economically, and with due speed in the opening of a ship canal through the American Isthmus.

The proper power of the Government to be employed in this work is the Congress of the United States, which can dispose of every question that has arisen or can arise in this imbroglio, in a single bill, to be openly discussed and passed upon in both Houses.

To divide this great subject into three parts—one to be controlled by the President in his executive powers, including his supposed arbitrary powers in diplomacy and his real authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, another part to be controlled by the President and the Senate as the treaty-making power, and another by the legislative power in making appropriations, that are the life of the whole scheme—is dangerous, perplexing, and absurd, if Congress has the power to do all that can be done and to direct and control all who can possibly participate in this national work. Congress has unquestionably that full power, and all of this matter ought to be concentrated in the hands of one body consisting of the two Houses, that has that amplitude of power.

It is especially unfortunate that the present shape of the vital questions now presented for adjustment is such that the treaty-making power is called into action for three most serious and dangerous purposes.

One of these is the repeal of every appropriation made for the construction of a canal either on the Panama route or the Nicaraguan route in what is called the Spooner law.

I will not discuss this question. I prefer to state it as the opinion of every lawyer in the Senate to whom the question has been presented by me, and they are many and very able, that the Hay-Varilla treaty, when ratified, will repeal all of those appropriations.

It is their opinion, and I regard it as an undeniable and indis-

putable legal proposition, that the ratification of the Hay-Varilla treaty does repeal every appropriation in the Spooner law, taken in connection with the action of the President of the United States in declaring in his message to Congress that the door of opportunity for treating with Colombia was closed at the time of the adjournment of their late session of Congress, and of course it is closed now, since it is asserted by the President, and has been approved or ratified by many governments, that Colombia has ceased to have any sovereignty over the Isthmus of Panama.

Another purpose is to annul all legislation and all our national compacts in respect of any canal on the Nicaragua route.

A third purpose is to fix an obligation on Congress that respect for the nation will forbid it to repudiate, no matter how it may be tainted with corruption and injustice, to pay a great price to the New Panama Canal Company for its claims that are fraudulent and unjust.

Congress should have full power and opportunity, untrammelled by the action of the treaty-making power, to pass upon this subject.

In the Senate this question, if it is permitted to be inquired into, will be heard behind closed doors, and when it comes out of the Senate it will be regarded as a decree from which no appeal will lay to the public conscience.

The people and the Congress of the United States will all be considered as bound absolutely by that decree of the Senate passed in an executive session as a part of the treaty-making power of this country.

By asserting its power to legislate as to the entire subject, Congress will escape from the alleged moral effect of the decree of the Senate that Panama is in fact an organized treaty power, empowered to participate with the Senate and the President in enacting supreme laws for the people and Government of the United States.

Without repeating on this occasion the facts and the reasons that make this situation so utterly repugnant to our conceptions of duty and national propriety, it is not too much to say that it is derogatory to the character of this Republic that we have aided to set up a few men in authority at Panama, and by our diplomatic recognition and protection have coddled them into a treaty-making power, to sit in their chambers, and, in their own way, that is wholly unknown to us, enact supreme laws, in conjunction with our President and Senate, for 80,000,000 of free and self-governing people.

It is better—and I prefer it—that the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled should enact these laws, having the unabridged power to do so.

I will not at this moment discuss the question of the methods employed in the negotiation or in the other steps taken in it or as to the persons engaged in the partition of that diplomatic abomination. That was a Panama Canal Company operation, of which I will speak fully at another time.

If Congress ever gets the opportunity or is required to look into the doings of M. Bunau-Varilla in that transaction, the end of that vital feature of the Hay-Varilla treaty will soon be reached. With its exposure some lofty heads will fall into the basket of the political guillotine. That will be a "business" operation.

I wish to read in support of that statement an article from the New York Sun, as follows:

PARIS, January 19, 1904.

A meeting to oppose the sale of the Panama Canal to the United States was held here to-day. The treaty representatives of the Latin-American republics were present.

I suppose that means that all the plenipotentiaries from all of the Latin-American states were present at that meeting.

M. Thiebaud denounced the sale as criminal. He said the Government had failed in its duty in the premises, and that the company was a gang of speculators.

He attacked the Crédit Lyonnais, but his special thunder was reserved for M. Bunau-Varilla, the minister of Panama at Washington, whom he called a traitor, and whose firm he declared was compelled to refund two millions overcharged for work done for the old company.

That locates that eminent plenipotentiary among the sixty whom the Government of France refused to name to Admiral Walker's Commission when they were in Paris, as being the men who had been convicted in the French courts, some of them for crimes against the old company and sentenced to the penitentiary, and others against whom large judgment had been recovered in the courts of France, all of which crimes were condoned to them and all of which judgments were entered as being satisfied upon their promise to form the New Panama Canal Company under the decrees of the French courts and to complete that canal. It seems that M. Thiebaud, in a public assemblage, where more than 500 people were met, denounced our minister from Panama as being one of the persons concerned in that rascality, and that he was compelled to refund \$2,000,000—or it may have been francs—overcharged for work done for the old company.

M. Thiebaud denounced M. Jusserand, the French ambassador at Washington, for receiving such a plenipotentiary with open arms.

He added that he feared that the appetite of the United States had been only whetted by devouring Spain's colonies. Panama would be followed by the French colonies.

He demanded that M. Delcassé, the French foreign minister, clarify the actual status of M. Bunau-Varilla.

I will add the latest news of this "uprising:"

[New York Evening Post, January 20, 1904.]

DISAFFECTION IN FRANCE—FRENCH GOVERNMENT OFFICERS SAY PANAMA AGITATION IS NOT IMPORTANT.

PARIS, January 20, 1904.

Following the address of George Thiebaud last evening at the meeting of representatives of all the republics of Latin-America (called especially for the bondholders of the Panama Canal Company, members of the Chamber and Senate, and of the municipal council, the press, financial companies, and engineer societies, and commercial and industrial unions), against American control of the Panama Canal, some unrepresentative newspapers are seeking to have the French Parliament take up the Panama question.

The Patrie gives sensational prominence to a series of questions which, it says, will be propounded in the Chamber of Deputies to the ministers of justice and foreign affairs. These questions seek to impute irregularity in the transfer of the old canal company to the new company, and criticise Foreign Minister Delcassé for not sending warships to Panama when the revolution occurred.

The Government officials say the agitation is not important, as it represents the views of a small, disaffected element.

[New York Evening Post, Wednesday, January 20, 1904.]

What is this? Bunau-Varilla denounced in Paris as a fraudulent contractor? So the morning dispatches announce, and unpleasantly corroborative evidence lies before us in the Gil Blas of November 18, 1903. That newspaper gave some very damaging extracts from official documents bearing upon the "affaires de Panama." For example, the procureur-général, M. Quesnay de Beaurepaire, charged M. Philippe Bunau-Varilla by name with having got up a contracting firm to bleed the company, partly by means of false reports of excavations made.

A former secretary of the company testified that he had resigned rather than sign a contract which involved an agreement by M. Bunau-Varilla to give a "rake off" (une remise) of 1 franc 40 centimes per meter. Finally, Gil Blas quotes from the company's bulletin to show that Bunau-Varilla's firm was paid for excavations in one section of the canal, amounting to 1,724,536 cubic meters, although the work actually done was only 818,500 meters. Suits were threatened, but were dropped when Bunau-Varilla and his associates subscribed 2,200,000 francs in new shares.

All this would be serious business for any man, but for a silver-tongued diplomat, hand in glove with the Government of the United States in the great work of creating a nation "in the interests of civilization," it is something which requires instant attention. Yet M. Bunau-Varilla, erstwhile so loquacious, refuses to talk about these charges against his own integrity. Does the President know about them? It has been stated recently in Washington dispatches that Minister Bunau-Varilla was to resign as soon as the treaty is ratified. That may imply that his record has been brought to the attention of the State Department. But if the thing is bad enough to force his retirement later, for him to hold on will simply mean the bottling up of a scandal only to explode with greater violence afterwards.

If this bill becomes the law, the Panama Canal Company will be required to content itself with complying with its obligations in good faith and in working out its contracts with Colombia, if that is agreeable to it. The New York and Paris syndicates will be deprived of the opportunity to rob the people by their speculations in the bonds and stocks of the old Panama Canal Company that gave wings to the Mercury they dispatched to Washington to demand the immediate conclusion of the Hay-Varilla treaty under false accusations against his co-commissioners that they were opposed to some of the provisions of that treaty and would not sign it and would put obstacles in the way when they arrived here. They were then on their way between New York and Washington, and the treaty was signed in order that it might be concluded before their arrival to participate in the negotiations, they being commissioners Messrs. Amador and Boyd, appointed by the junta in Panama and charged with the express duty of negotiating this treaty in conjunction with M. Bunau-Varilla.

But I must not delay in the discussion of Varilla at this time. I will leave him for the present alone in his glory, which he thus describes in an interview with the correspondent of the New York Tribune of to-day:

With reference to my resignation, I have only to say that I have served the Republic of Panama in a diplomatic capacity because its interests were coincident with the Panama Canal, and when the salvation of the Panama Canal is assured by the ratification of the pending treaty there will be no reason for my further representing the Republic of Panama. This has been understood from the start. Once the treaty has been ratified, my task will be completed, my end accomplished.

I will have fulfilled the pledge I made to myself twenty-three years ago in the Ecole Polytechnique, at the conclusion of a lecture delivered by De Laesep himself. I shall have remained faithful to the motto of that great scientific school, "For the country, for science, and for glory."

With the alleged \$2,000,000 of profits in the hands of his syndicate, earned by his rushing the signatures to the treaty, before Amador and Boyd, joint commissioners with him, could arrive in Washington, his "glory" has taken on the golden tint that is so worshiped by the admirers of the success that succeeds.

I wish to explain the purposes and effect of this bill, and the facts of the situation that we are compelled to confront and that it is designed to meet, and for which condition the country is in no way responsible.

The situation we must all try to relieve, so as to save the country from perils that are moving against us like the pestilence that walketh in darkness and wasteth at noonday, is not of our creation. It has been forced upon the country by willful dis-

obedience of the plainest mandates of the law by the President of the United States.

But for a single act of disobedience, those fearful troubles, with worse to come, could not have occurred. The enumeration of them is distinct, in the public conscience. They can not be forgotten any more than the scars that are graven on a human heart by the sins of any sensate being. They are the defiance of public law, under pretexts that are mere inventions, too shallow to require refutation.

The obligations of our treaty of 1846 with Colombia have been broken without excuse, and only to gratify disappointed ambition and personal resentments that have no just foundation in any facts that are known. This unjust and unreasonable attitude is forced upon the country, and we owe it to ourselves, to Colombia, and to all Christendom to repair the injustice as well as we can in other ways, because it is impossible to restore the status quo ante.

It is not possible to reinstate the rights of Colombia as they existed prior to November 3, 1903. The consequences of this breach of treaty obligations are no longer avoidable.

The Republic of Panama has been charged with the care of the transit by the express orders of the Secretary of State to our consul at the city of Panama. This transposition of treaty rights, duties, and powers by our act, without even a consultation with Panama to get her consent to assume these duties, is the most extraordinary case of forced heirship that is found in all the romances of law or diplomacy. Colombia is relieved of all her treaty obligations and Panama is invested with them by the order of Mr. Hay.

If President Roosevelt should conceive a dislike to or have a distrust of the present Government of Panama, he could, in the exercise of the same powers, transfer these treaty obligations to a new "uprising" and, with it, the sovereignty of Panama. The laws of nations were violated by our recognition of the de facto government when the neutrality of the act was vitiated by the fact that we had a distinct purpose and motive, for our own advantage, in making such recognition. And Colombia being then engaged in the effort to repress the rebellion with arms, our want of neutrality in the recognition put us in alliance with Panama, which was armed intervention. Our statutes as to neutrality were violated by sending our ships of war to support the insurrection in Panama.

These acts of Government are not revocable. They will stand, and their consequences will follow them. To get rid of their consequences we must reach some agreement with Colombia. The state of war between Panama and Colombia will continue until Colombia is ready to abandon the conflict, and that will be when the Spaniard forgets his pride of country and his chivalrous blood has been polluted or has escaped from his veins. As long as it is convenient to avoid war with the United States Colombia will not attack the Republic of Panama.

She is now engaged in a lawsuit in the French courts and must test the question whether, as to her rights of any sort, her title to all of her property has passed to a small party of actual insurrectionists in Panama, while she disputes the lawfulness, the independence, and the sovereignty of Panama, not being dismayed because other governments have acknowledged it and because the United States, that is trying to appropriate the best part of Panama, is affording her protection. How this lawsuit will end no one knows; but that it can not be justly decided against Colombia everybody knows.

This open dispute by Colombia of the sovereignty of Panama is notice to the world that Colombia is still insisting upon her rights without qualification or diminution. Thus far the war against Panama is a litigation. If that is decided against Colombia it will hasten her next step.

Colombia is not quarreling with Europe over this recognition of Panama. She knows and these states know that the conditional recognition given by France is a compact with Panama, which makes France guardian ad hoc for the New Panama Canal Company, destroys the Monroe doctrine, and that the Latin states of America, and all the states of Europe rejoice at the breaking of that cordon of protection we drew around the coasts of America. This is a second step in the war with the United States, and it has won a dangerous position for Colombia.

The third step is the transfer of our trade with all the Spanish-American states to Europe and Asia. The ambulances are rapidly filling with our dead and wounded in this commercial war, which will be of long duration. The long final step will be the predatory warfare of the bushwhacker, the Indian, the Panama deserters, and the loose characters who now swarm in Panama, and will be recruited from the low and desperate characters, such as have heretofore resorted to Panama in flocks, who will gather together again to enjoy the spoils of every device of lotteries, monte banks, and vice that evil men can invent. The refuge of every scoundrel who will be attracted to Panama, when he is suspected or has been convicted of lawlessness, will be in the mountains and dense

jungles of Panama, and his companions in revengeful warfare will be the Indians of the eastern Isthmus and of all Colombia, led or directed by the Spaniards.

Our troops in camps or cantonments will swelter in the intolerable heat and will die of yellow fever, Chagres fever, smallpox, and beriberi, which is about to become the master plague of Panama. To construct trochas, as Weyler did in Cuba, to keep back the Indians will become more futile than his failure to prevent parties from passing at will between the eastern and western ends of that island. If anything could add to the horrors of the hell that has its home in Panama, it will be the long Indian war that will occur in that region.

If we build and maintain a canal at Panama, it must be with the help of peace and the good will of Colombia. We have the advantage of them in numbers and arms and all the resources of of war, except in dogged pluck and courage. They have the advantage of us in the argument, because our attitude is wrong, and that is the trouble of the souls of a people of high order of Christian civilization. The canal is easy of access to them by land, while we can only reach it by long voyages. We had better agree with our adversary quickly while he is in the way. To prepare for the adjustment with Colombia and to control the population of Colon, Panama, and the canal zone while constructing the canal and operating it every dictate of reason demands that we shall have the fullest powers of government consistent with our Constitution over the entire area of the Republic of Panama.

The chief point in this control is that the powers of government should be undivided, and that the United States shall be able to hold every official in Panama to the full measure of his responsibilities. There is some revolt against the annexation of any part of American territory among good people, and it is a bitter pill when it is the result of the spoliation of a sister republic of which Bolivar, the Washington of South America, was the founder. Few persons could be more reluctant than I am to aid this first encroachment on Isthmian America.

I can not misunderstand the feelings of such a man as Secretary Hay, when he would put aside the annexation of Panama as an apparent reproach to the animus of his policy in negotiating the Hay-Varilla treaty. His ambition is not so broad as that would indicate. He was not out for territorial aggrandizement in his foray against Colombia. He had milder views, softened by sympathy for men who claimed to be oppressed by Colombia, and he would not claim the annexation of more than 500 square miles of Panama to the United States. That he took; and his conscience did not reprove him, nor should it have done so, for the absolute control of the 10-mile zone from ocean to ocean is indispensable to a canal in Panama.

I will now read from the third article of this treaty and afterwards from the second article what our powers are to be in the 10-mile zone when the treaty is ratified.

ARTICLE III.

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power, and authority within the zone mentioned and described in Article II of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said Article II, which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority.

There could not be stated, Mr. President, a more perfect act of annexation than that, because it places that 10-mile zone, which is 158 miles long between its outer borders, within the exclusive sovereign jurisdiction of the United States, so that any act of Congress relating to the people, the land, the property, the peace, the government in any form within that canal zone belongs to Congress indisputably. If there is any country in the world that is entirely subject to the laws of the Congress of the United States, that country is thereby annexed to the United States, and there is nothing to the contrary stated in the treaty.

Therefore Mr. Hay, in this very article of the treaty, annexed 500 square miles of territory in Panama to the United States, cutting right through the middle of the Republic and taking that portion of its territory which I suppose would amount to 90 per cent at least of the value of the entire area they own and possess. There we have established not only the principle but the fact of annexation as to the 500-mile zone.

In the bill I present the question is only whether or not, for reasons of public necessity and public safety, that zone shall be increased. I do not know where to stop it, except at the outer boundaries of the Isthmus of Panama. It might be profitable to give the lower part of that zone, that we have no use for, to Colombia and to settle certain boundary questions between Panama and Costa Rica by yielding that question, and we might give more than that with advantage, unless it interferes with the headwaters of the streams which are tributary to the Chagres River. In locating this zone the following language is used:

ARTICLE II.

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of a zone of land and land under water for the con-

struction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said canal of the width of 10 miles, extending to the distance of 5 miles on each side of the center line of the route of the canal to be constructed; the said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific Ocean to a distance of 3 marine miles from mean low-water mark, with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, which are included within the boundaries of the zone above described, shall not be included within this grant.

The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said enterprise.

The Republic of Panama further grants in like manner to the United States in perpetuity all islands within the limits of the zone above described and in addition thereto the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco.

There we have a perfect plan of annexation, as to the 10-mile feature of which, with the exclusion of the cities of Panama and Colon, our sovereignty is perfect and complete; but outside of that we have an additional element or attribute of sovereignty that Panama can not dispute at all, under which we are permitted to take lands and condemn them for the purposes of a canal, and also to control the water courses that are tributary to the Chagres River, or any water courses that we may find necessary for the better protection or maintenance of the canal. Having gone that far in this treaty, to halt at this line, to say that we will not go beyond it, no matter how urgent and imperious the necessity may be, is simply an attitude of folly, of weakness, and will bring us into trouble and into contempt if we undertake to execute this treaty in that form.

So the question of the acquisition of territory in Panama is now settled conclusively by this treaty, and the only open question in regard to it at all is whether or not it is necessary for us, by annexing the entire State, to acquire such authority there as is needful and indispensable to protect us against the people residing there and also against the outside world.

The sovereignty of the United States in that canal zone under the Hay-Varilla treaty is as perfect and exclusive as it is in Porto Rico or New Mexico. Indeed, it is more absolute. It is not restrained by any treaty relations with Spain or any other power. We take the jurisdiction of land and water and people and of all things therein.

But the treaty carved the cities of Colon and Panama and their adjacent harbors out of this canal zone and left them as an imperium in imperio, in the heart of it, to say nothing of these breeding places of pestilence and nurseries of vice and crime, than which there are none worse in the whole world. They are and will be more than ever the cockpits for the pronunciadores and unattached generals and inferior officers, whose passion and whose profession and living it is to create strife in politics and deadly mischief at every opportunity.

With a canal zone to prey upon, and the easy chance to compel us to keep heavy and expensive garrisons in the zone, and large bodies of police there, so as to bring money and dupes for gamblers and vice resorts into those cities, our troubles will soon accumulate until we will be compelled to extend our jurisdiction over those cities. We know that this will occur very soon, and why should we not be honest with those people and with ourselves and our own people and do that in the beginning that we must do at an early day?

It may be said without reserve that no matter what is said in this treaty, we intend to govern the cities of Panama and Colon and all the contributory country mentioned in the treaty just as we will govern the canal zone. And on the first occasion when the necessity is developed we will govern the Republic of Panama in the same way.

While we have the making and the ratification of this treaty in our own hands, let us not flatter and play with that Republic, as a child plays with a doll, but let us, like American Senators, speak and act the truth in the fear of God, with perfect justice to the people of Panama and toward our own people.

The fourth section, relating to the Panama Canal Company, strikes the vital point of every trouble we have ever had, except the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, in our efforts to open an American isthmian canal. Until that pirate got aboard the ship was safe and free. It has now, and has had since De Lesseps made his "business" visit to the United States, too many great speculators behind it and has made too many friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, to be passed over with neglect. I have too long contended with it behind the closed doors of the Senate, where, whatever gets out, nothing not desired by the majority gets in, not to be anxious that it should have at least one hearing before the Congress of the United States.

And that is one of the purposes of this bill. It is that article 22 of this treaty shall not put upon this country the obligations—unknown, unascertained, and undescribed obligations—of a con-

templated purchase of that property, but that the Congress of the United States shall know before it accepts that contract all of its terms and all the facts that affect its honesty, its integrity, and its decency. Our rights under the twenty-second article of this treaty are made to depend entirely on the ratification by the Senate of this unknown, undescribed, "contemplated contract."

I do not believe, Mr. President, that any party is so pressed, or that any exigency or any necessity that has ever occurred in this Government or any other has ever been held sufficient to bind a parliamentary body to the adoption of a contract of purchase of a vast property, heretofore estimated at \$40,000,000 in the Spooner law, without knowing anything about the terms or what it is to be.

What is all this quarrel in France about now? Why are they contesting the right of Colombia to be represented by the 5,000,000 francs of stock that she owns in the New Panama Canal Company? Why has that company refused admittance to her delegate into the meeting of stockholders when he had been sitting in those meetings for as many as twelve or fifteen years? It is because the suggestion was made that Colombia had ceased to be the owner of that stock under this forced heirship of Panama, and that Panama, the sovereign Republic recognized by France upon a condition precedent, was the owner of that stock, and here the question touches us which rages in France.

They say in France—so the newspapers inform us, and I appeal to the newspapers, Mr. President, because there is no other source of information open to this Senate, nor will there be. All the resolutions you may put before this body to corkscrew information out of the State Department are going to be dead failures. Even that presentation of the honorable senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] for information respecting this whole situation has been delayed, and will be denied.

No answer will come, at least before the question of the ratification of this treaty is forced upon the Senate. Therefore I appeal to the newspapers, and I make that appeal with no sort of doubt that the great leading newspapers of the world in a matter of this kind will use their utmost endeavors to get clean, clear, and truthful information. I accept it, Mr. President, as being satisfactory, because we can get no other, and for the reason that it comes from an authoritative source in a large degree.

These newspapers inform us of this controversy in the stockholders' meeting of the New Panama Canal Company and of Colombia being rejected for the reasons to which I have just adverted.

We read that immediately upon the arrival of Señor Reyes from Colombia he was accompanied by Mr. Holguin. Mr. Holguin went straightway to Paris to present the rights which had been denied to Colombia in the courts, and it was his intervention there, by authority of Colombia, that started up this litigation.

When Reyes got through with his efforts here, whatever they may have been; when Reyes got through with his experiment in diplomacy here, he also went to Paris, the Colombians, clamoring for his not having returned home, doing the man the injustice of supposing that perhaps he had got his pockets stuffed with money here, and, like many other leading South Americans, had gone to Paris to enjoy it.

But that is not true of Reyes. He did no such thing; he would not have accepted it if it had been tendered to him, and I am sure it was not tendered to him. He has gone there on the business of Colombia, to superintend, investigate, and prosecute that suit and to get a determination from the courts of France as to whether the recognition that was made by M. Delcasse there is such a one as will exclude those courts from jurisdiction or will compel them to follow the political currents in France, or whether he can get a decision in France upon the merits of his case.

Suppose the decision in France is made that this forced heirship of Panama does not carry with it these properties and rights connected with the Panama Canal Company over to Panama from Colombia; there is a question behind that remaining to be considered, and we, at least, can not deny it. The Panama Canal Company, in which Colombia holds stock, owns 90 per cent, I will say, of the stock of the Panama Railroad Company, a New York corporation. They bought that stock in open market and paid 175 for it when it was selling in New York for about 85 or 90. But they wanted it. In their estimation they were obliged to have it.

That stock was all transferred to the New Panama Canal Company, and it is to be held by that company even after the failure to complete the canal becomes an acknowledged or even a judicial fact. Upon what terms? The payment of 4,000,000 francs for a property that is worth not less than they bought it at—the price of \$15,000,000—used as bribes to these Panama culprits to get them to get up this New Panama Canal Company.

Now, Colombia has got her interest in that stock. That is a piece of property that is owned by Colombia as personal property that did not pass to Panama. We can not buy it from Panama and get a title, but we can get the railroad bed and all of its

appurtenances and appliances from Panama, and the New York company will be able to conduct its operations there, and, with our consent, would be able to pay the \$250,000 a year to Panama instead of to Colombia. But that action on our part would not give an acquittance as against the company even in our own courts. No court would respect a receipt for that money given by Panama to Colombia not only until this treaty had been ratified, but also until it had been judicially ascertained that that was property that went over from Colombia to Panama in consequence of her secession.

These situations concern the people of the United States. They are involved, difficult, intricate, almost insoluble even by the judgment of the Senate; but they are all solved in the twenty-second article of the treaty, which provides that our rights under that article shall not take effect—and, I believe, under any article, shall not take effect—as absolute rights until we have consummated this contemplated purchase. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has no power as a treaty-making body to legislate in respect of this very complicated and unusual and dangerous situation.

If we need the richest part of Panama and are willing to cut the Republic in twain to get it, why should we not take the entire Department and govern it under the benignant laws of the United States? If this is a violation of principle or sound policy, the acquisition of 500 square miles is only smaller in degree. The principle is the same. If this is done to evince a spirit of self-denial by the United States, it is much out of place in our programme as to Panama and Colombia. The robe of charity we are wearing in the service of this cruel and covetous raid does not conceal the cloven foot. Our demand should be all of Panama or none, for there may be other canal routes leading into better harbors that we may prefer to open.

We now protect all of Panama from Colombia, so that if we are not vigilant to a degree Panama will be destroyed, or it may even desert us on our first serious quarrel and go back to Colombia or into some confederation that may be organized to annoy us, as is expressly provided for in this treaty.

We give her the power to enter into new governments, only reserving what rights we have got there as being unchanged by the fact of her making such political alliances.

In the event of her forming such a confederation with other powers or of her withdrawing and going back to Colombia, as she has a right to do under this treaty, it would take armies and navies even to hold the canal, and its protection would be impossible for any considerable time with a hostile people and soldiers in and along the canal zone, and in possession of the fortress at Panama.

Mr. President, if time served me and I had the strength on this occasion, I would present another feature of this situation that this treaty is intended to destroy, which is very serious to us, and in the future may become utterly destructive of all of our hopes in respect of the canal. There is no assurance of a positive character given by any engineer who has ever reported upon or testified to—for they have sworn about this matter, as well as reported about it—there is no assurance of any substantial and positive character that a canal at Panama is practicable.

As to the sea-level idea, on which some Senators have commented here, the French engineers, the American Isthmian Canal Commission, and I believe every other engineer who has ever said anything on the subject, have come to the conclusion that a sea-level canal there is absolutely impracticable, either to dig or to maintain, and especially to maintain.

Here is a tide of 21 feet, coming once a day every day, and sometimes twice a day, and rushing into the mouth of that canal, which requires a tide lock, and that tide lock is a great obstruction to the facilities of commerce, for ships can not pass through that tide lock when the tide is in. They have to wait until it goes out; and that is an obstruction which will not permit more than twenty-four vessels in twenty-four hours, on the average, going through that canal—a fact which some gentlemen seem totally to ignore.

But there is no assurance that the dam at Bohio can be built and made permanent. It is not worth my while, as I have neither the time nor the inclination just now, to go into any inquiry as to the facts upon which I predicate this statement; but every engineer who testified said that the work to be done at the Bohio dam was beyond the experience of any engineer. It was a matter to be calculated for on conditions that could be created, that were not in existence at this time, by the ingenuity and the perseverance of man. When we get to digging that canal, Mr. President, under this law we may very soon find that there are difficulties that we can not possibly overcome.

When that is the case, what will be the next most desirable situation for the United States to be in? It will be to have an alternative route, to which we can resort whenever it may appear that that canal is impracticable. In doing this, if we should hereafter

be forced to an alternate route, Panama would still have its railroad, which is one of the finest pieces of property, if not the finest piece of property, of that description in the world. The last report that anybody has been enabled to unearth about it shows that it was earning 19 per cent on a capitalization of \$15,000,000.

They hide their reports in order to prevent us from knowing anything about what they are doing. They do in that matter as they do in everything else. It is a game of secrecy, exclusion, and exploitation. Addition, division, and silence are the characteristics of all of the operations of that canal company and of all the men who are associated with it and of the men who are upholding it as the means of speculation in the bonds of the old company and on the Bourse, and also as the means of getting at the \$40,000,000, as they will. The stockholders of the New Panama Canal Company will get near 100 per cent on the money they have put into that canal.

Now, when these propositions confront us is it not reasonable, Mr. President, that the Congress of the United States should have the opportunity of considering them and of imposing upon the President of the United States the stipulations that I have put into this bill, which I shall read:

SEC. 4. The sum of \$40,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be applied as follows and upon the following conditions, namely—

The next part of it, which I shall not read, because I am not very well, is extracted from the Spooner Act as to the making of this contract.

And after such contract or purchase is made it shall be submitted to Congress for its ratification and shall not be finally obligatory until it is so ratified; whereupon the President is authorized to draw his warrant on the Treasury of the United States for such sum, not to exceed \$40,000,000, as Congress shall make available for such purchase.

The President shall also report to Congress the terms and conditions of such purchase and the names of the persons or corporations that are lawfully authorized and empowered to make a sale and conveyance of such property, and to receive and give acquittance for the sums of money to be paid for the property and rights of said canal companies purchased under the provisions of this section of this act.

The President shall also report to Congress the facts he may ascertain as the basis of the right of either of said Panama Canal companies to make a sale and conveyance of their property and concessionary or other rights to the United States, and of the state and condition of those concessions and upon what laws or decrees of Colombia they rest for their validity.

I do not propose to refuse to these men any just allowance that may be made under contract with them for what they have in Panama or elsewhere pertaining to this canal company, but I propose that that subject shall undergo the investigation of Congress. The Senate, in an executive session, can not do that. It is futile to undertake it, because there is no matter of legislation in which they can participate. Therefore the subject ought to be opened up and full and fair justice done, as will be done by the act of the Congress of the United States.

Now, the other proposition which I mentioned and was about to discuss is this: The treaty, if ratified, destroys so much of the Spooner Act as relates to the construction of a canal at Nicaragua, because it takes away the appropriation. It has to be renewed by an act of Congress after the treaty has been passed, which in itself, when ratified, becomes the supreme law of the United States, before the President or anybody else can use the appropriation in the Spooner Act for the building of a canal at Nicaragua.

There are many contingencies which may arise. There are some that now present themselves to the United States with great force, in which it may be very essential that we should abide by and perform that noble and valorous act of President McKinley when he acquired the basic rights of concession from Nicaragua and Costa Rica under agreements signed, sealed, and interchanged, that are still in force.

We may have to treat with Nicaragua and Costa Rica when we find that we are driven to it, either by the pressure of public opinion upon the President or by obstructions that are as yet not fully understood in Panama, by difficulties that we may find down there in the protection of the canal route against the villainous population that inhabits and lives all around it, composed of men who are there for no other purpose in this world except spoil and vice; men who do not go there for agriculture, for the mechanic arts, for merchandise—or at least very few of them; men who do not go there for any kind of industry, but who go there to prey upon the vices of the laborers and the officers, and live in the whirlpool of unmentionable vice, that exists and has always existed in that unfortunate and unhappy land.

We may find it necessary to go elsewhere to get this canal. What then should we do? Certainly we should do nothing to strike down rights that already exist or provisions of law that already exist and contract rights between the President of the United States, Mr. McKinley, and Costa Rica and Nicaragua. To say the least of it we ought to put into an act of Congress a reservation of these rights to the United States, untouched by this treaty or by anything else. But it will be too late to do that when this treaty has been ratified, because that will break the

contract with Costa Rica and Nicaragua on one side and the United States on the other.

Therefore, and for reasons of public faith and for the purpose of establishing confidence among the people as to the building of any canal anywhere, I have insisted and do now insist, and in this bill I insist and make provision for an appropriation, the same amount of money mentioned in the Spooner Act and upon the same terms and conditions, except in respect to the treaty with Colombia that are set forth in that measure.

When we have ratified that treaty and destroyed these appropriations and have obliterated these contracts with Nicaragua and Costa Rica, those contracts can not be restored hereafter, we then are thrown upon Congress for appropriations to do any work in Panama—an appropriation to get the \$10,000,000 that we pledge to Panama; an appropriation of \$10,000,000, the first specific appropriation, for work on the canal. All these are swept away by this treaty, and we have to come into Congress to open the fight again for these appropriations.

Where will we begin and where will we end? We will begin where we began fifteen years ago, and every enemy that the canal has ever had will at once appear from the sage and chaparral and swarm around Congress for the purpose of destroying any appropriation at all. This long battle will have been won and lost. This great appropriation will all have perished and with it our agreements with Costa Rica and Nicaragua. We commence de novo. From the ground up we will have to work our way again.

When will another appropriation be made? There is one proposition I can safely assert and that is, never so long as M. Bunau-Varilla can make speculations on the stock board at the Bourse. Another is, never so long as Mr. Cromwell shall hold this matter in abeyance as he has been doing now since the beginning of the civil war in Colombia; never so long as the transcontinental railroads can prevent it; never so long as those gentlemen who are opposed to any canal on principles that are entirely satisfactory to themselves can prevent it.

We throw open the whole door of debate and discussion, opposition, and antagonism, and the President of the United States, whatever power he may have over the Army and the Navy and the Republican party, will not find himself able to force those appropriations through. Indeed, I do not think he wants to do it. I do not believe that he intends to attempt to do it. It is better for him to leave promises open to the public during the Presidential campaign than it is to meet the consequences of actual legislation.

Now, should we not, with this power in our hands that we have on this floor to-day, say to the Republican party, "Take up the subject and make your appropriations? Then consider the necessity of ratifying the treaty." Pass the act that I have the honor to recommend to the Senate and you will get one that will accomplish the whole purpose without any treaty, not by force, but by leaving this subject of annexation to the constituent assembly now sitting in Panama.

Will they refuse it when we give them a government there such as there is in Porto Rico or in the Philippines or in Hawaii or in Alaska, under which their own men will have participation in the affairs of the country, with the power of this great nation to back them, and peace with Colombia secured? Will they refuse? Mr. President, it is beyond conjecture that they will be so unwise as to refuse a situation like that.

Now, we have it in our power, by acting upon this subject rationally, to settle the whole of it and to reconcile every man in Congress. I have one objection to the Nicaragua route that is overcome by this treaty, a difficulty I have always experienced in my various efforts to accomplish the construction of a canal on the Nicaragua line, and that is that we could not possibly get from Nicaragua and Costa Rica—and their boundary between the two, and involving the ownership of the lake or a line through the middle of it and the San Juan River—that degree of sovereignty that we get under the third article of this treaty. We could not get it. Possibly we have got it under Mr. McKinley's great protocols; at all events, we ought not to put ourselves in such position as to prevent our right to claim that we have got it. We have got no power in respect of the isthmian country that we ought in the slightest degree to throw away.

I will ask the Senate, at an early day, for the privilege of discussing these protocols as to their legal and diplomatic effect. They are of the greatest importance to this Government, now and in the near future.

We are liable to be met there with difficulties arising out of the spirit of the people and the Government and difficulties inspired from other parts of the earth to prevent us from controlling in supreme right, I will say, or in sovereignty any canal route across that Isthmus. We have it in our power to secure the whole. Pass this bill, and we will get them all. Shall we ever need them?

Mr. President, build your canal at Panama, which will let twenty-four ships through every twenty-four hours, and you have

not an approximation to the capacity of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. The Sault Ste. Marie Canal does more business than the Suez Canal, very largely more business. More tonnage passes through it. There is not ours alone, but it is supplemented by the Canadian Sault Ste. Marie Canal, just in sight of it, which does very nearly as much business as we do there. Our business in thirty years there has risen from 6,000 tons passing through the canal to near 40,000,000 tons per annum.

What will be the traffic between the oceans, with all the mighty forces that are being employed in every possible respect in every island in the Pacific Ocean—every one capable of civilization and inhabitation—and along the vast coast from Siam up to Japan, and around our coast by way of Alaska down to the crossing of this canal, and the South American coast, and that vast continent of the southern Pacific, Australia, one of the most immense and important regions in the whole world?

That great breadth of country, demanding so much from the industrial people of England and all of Europe, and of the United States more particularly, will find through the transit of a single canal a very embarrassed and a very difficult passage. We will want two canals before we get one constructed.

Now, shall we, in measuring ourselves up to the situation, in trying as American Senators to comprehend the future of this country, begin by repealing the advantages that we have, throwing them to the winds, upon the supposition that we are not going to need them? Is that statesmanship, or is it patriotism, I should like to know?

This bill, if I have been fortunate in framing it, and I have of course no partialities for its text that I would not willingly submit to the judgment of any gentleman of either party for suggestion or of improvement—this bill, as I understand it, and with reference to the purposes for which I have prepared it, lays down the basis upon which the Panama Canal will be built if Mr. Roosevelt has the power still and the will to violate the Spooner Act and go along and build it, for we appropriate the money in this bill to do it with. It is left to his conscience and between his conscience and the American people and his God as to whether he will obey the mandate of the laws of the United States as he has sworn to do.

I make all provision, so that he can get \$10,000,000 to pay Panama, \$3,000,000 cash down, presently available, for the benefit of the Government now existing in Panama; \$7,000,000 to be reserved in the Treasury of the United States, and to be applied to that Government and to the other municipal governments and the people of Panama, as in the wisdom of Congress shall be just. The appropriation is made, and the only question is as to the distribution of the money.

They have said that they want to invest their money in some securities that nobody could steal. They are afraid to put it into banks, for the bankers there have shown their corruptibility by taking \$140,000 of the money of Colombia out of the treasury and paying a part of it to bribe their troops to leave Panama. They are afraid of the banks. They are afraid of safes. If they are burglar proof, they are not proof against treachery and villainy on the part of the custodians. We will distribute this money, by acts of Congress, according to the necessities of those people, and the \$7,000,000 will go into the hands of people who need it and who will be improved and helped by it.

This bill also gives to him \$40,000,000, and not exceeding that sum, to comply with any contract which may be made with the New Panama Canal Company that he reports to Congress and that Congress ratifies. It retains the appropriation in favor of Nicaragua, to stand in the event that the \$10,000,000 is not first applied in Panama. It reverses the order of things. Nicaragua now has the call; it has the preference under the Spooner law. I propose to yield that, and to give to the President the power of his conscience to work upon the subject, he being responsible for it, and not Congress. But there is no denial in this bill of anything that has ever been claimed by anybody in favor of either route or in favor of the canal situation.

Then this bill gives \$15,000,000 to be used by the President of the United States in the pacification of Colombia. I did that not because I had any means of knowing the will or purpose of Colombia, but because it has been asserted here time and again—and I have not yet heard it denied—that the President had agreed with Colombia to pay her that sum or a smaller sum for her pacification—that a contract had been entered into.

Some gentleman connected officially with the affair was not willing to have it consummated lest it might be said that we had conducted all of this operation in Panama for the purpose of buying out Colombia with money and not upon those high principles of justice and national duty or necessity which might justify one nation in interfering with arms in the affairs of another. This bill puts \$15,000,000 in the hands of the President, which I suppose is a fully adequate sum, having no doubt that he could pacify Colombia with that.

Now, how will the footing add up? Take this treaty, and suppose that it is an actual appropriation. Give that character to it, if the lawyers on the other side of the Chamber are disposed to risk their reputations on so desperate a venture as that. Give it the effect of an appropriation—to carry out the appropriation in the Spooner Act—and how does the account stand? We pay \$10,000,000 under this bill. That I offer here to Panama, three millions of it cash. We pay ten millions, as it may be needed, for the construction purposes of a canal at Panama or Nicaragua, as the President may select.

The power of selection is not expressly given to him, but it is within the purview of what he supposes to be his rights, privileges, and duties. There are \$13,000,000, and that is all, against \$50,000,000 in the Spooner law, immediately available. It is \$13,000,000 against \$30,000,000.

We take time to work out the propositions. We do not embarrass the Government or the Treasury by this demand rushing in, as it will rush in, immediately upon the ratification of this treaty. These men, whose itching palms are continually searching for the doors of the Treasury of the United States, will come like a flock of eagles and demand their money, and they will get it under this treaty, if the Comptroller does not stop them. I propose to stop them and to investigate their rights as they go along. Let Congress act upon it, not the President, in making a contemplated contract, which is to be binding upon this country in respect to all its rights really acquired under the Hay-Varilla treaty.

Comparing this measure with the existing state of facts, and with the benefits and purposes of this treaty, and its recognition of the full, unexecuted force in every particular of the Spooner law, and comparing it with the condition that will be borne upon the country by this treaty, there can be no doubt of the advantage in the act I propose. No man can doubt its justice, its equity, its respect for opinions that have been crystallized into law in the Spooner Act. It maintains the majesty of the law, instead of leaving it a waif to wander about to seek an owner or a friend among the desert places of the world.

I did not expect, Mr. President, to go as far as I have gone in this matter to-day, because I really have not been in a condition to do so, but I am anxious to have this question settled—settled right; settled to the satisfaction of all concerned; settled on the basis of justice and respect for existing law; settled so as to protect the United States Government against the necessity of committing themselves in controversies for or against the recent strange and unusual conduct of the President in Panama; avoiding that; regarding what has been done as an accomplished fact, without inquiring into it in this bill, and acting upon these accomplished facts as the basis of our further action. I do that in the interest of peace and of good will and of success for an isthmian canal, and also of success in gathering within the powers of the United States the right to control in any and in every emergency the transit routes through the isthmian country of America.

I may have failed in my purpose. If so, there are wise men in the Senate on both sides of this Chamber to correct the failure with suggestions and to improve it. But the principle of the proposed act is right. It is an act of peace and reconciliation, and I hope it will be received by the gentlemen on both sides of this Chamber in that sense, no matter what their personal opinions may be or how vigorously they may have maintained them. I ask no man to abandon his opinions upon any feature of this case, but I protest that the Senate of the United States shall not follow the President in an open and unmistakable refusal on his part to obey the law of the land.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read twice, it will be referred—

Mr. MORGAN. To the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6295) for preventing the adulteration or misbranding of foods or drugs, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

RELATIONS WITH NEW GRANADA OR COLOMBIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 73, by Mr. GORMAN, calling upon the President for certain information touching former negotiations of the United States with the Governments of New Granada or Colombia, etc.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, yesterday when my remarks were interrupted by adjournment I had endeavored to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Republic of Panama is a fully equipped, existing, sovereign State, so acknowledged not only by us, but by all the great powers of the world, and that it could not be overthrown except by war and conquest.

The action of the United States and the other great powers of the world in recognizing the existence of the complete and sovereign State of Panama is irrevocable. We can not revoke it, neither can any of the other powers which have assented to it. The United States can not now take back the recognition which it gave to the Republic of Panama. So in dealing with the question before the Senate that fact must be taken into consideration, reckoned with, and acted upon.

There is one other fact which I did not speak of and which I wish to call the attention of the Senate to now. We have no longer a treaty with Colombia. Whatever rights we had under the treaty originally made with New Granada, which subsequently passed over to Colombia, we must now look to the Republic of Panama for, and whatever obligations we assumed by the treaty with Colombia we must perform to the Republic of Panama. So any guaranty of sovereignty which we made to New Granada originally and to Colombia, and any guaranty of the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, must be performed to the Republic of Panama; and whatever guaranties we received from Colombia through New Granada we must look to Panama to fulfill and carry out.

If New Granada guaranteed to us the right of way and transit through the Isthmus of Panama, as it did in the treaty of 1846, we have no longer any claim upon her to perform and discharge that obligation. We have a claim upon the Republic of Panama to discharge it as fully as we could ever have required Colombia to discharge it.

I think these facts have been overlooked. It seems to me that the discussions which we are indulging in here in the Senate are largely about transactions which have passed, and which, so far as the action of the Senate is concerned, have no bearing and are, indeed, inappropriate.

But there has been so much said to the effect that the action of this Government, if not absolutely dishonorable, has been unsupported by any law of our own, by any international law, or any right which the President might constitutionally exercise, that I wish in a few words to refer to these contentions.

I deny, Mr. President, that in the dealing of the Executive, and, as the Executive represents the Government, in the dealing of the Government with Colombia, in relation to the Panama revolution and to all the acts leading up to our recognition of the new Government—the Republic of Panama—there has been any act of war committed by the United States, that there has been any intervention of the United States as between Colombia and Panama. It is easy to make such charges; it is easy to talk in an excited way about acts of war and intervention, but when we in the Senate come to consider such matters it is time for definitions; it is time for specifications; it is time that the Senators who say the President has committed this Government to an act of war against Colombia should tell us what an act of war is, and what particular action of the President constitutes the act of war which they declare has been committed. It is quite time for Senators who talk so glibly about intervention to tell us what intervention is in the terms of international law.

I have listened in vain, Mr. President, for Senators to declare that any act done by this Government has constituted an act of war or has amounted to an intervention, and it is what the Government has done that is to be considered. It is what our officers, under the instructions of the Executive, have done that we are to look at, not what some Senator assumes that the President thought or desired or hoped for, but what he has done.

Now, what did the President do? I do not desire to excuse him. I would not desire to excuse him if anything had been done wrong, because the dispatches about which so much has been said here were sent by the heads of the Executive Departments, either real or acting, for I think I know that the President himself would not desire to shirk any responsibility in that matter.

Now, there was an expected revolution on the Isthmus of Panama. At the commencement of this discussion there were insinuations of all sorts expressed, with every possible ingenuity of language, that the President had been in some way in communication with the revolutionists; that the revolution had taken place with his knowledge and assent, and even with guilty knowledge. I think that is a matter of the past.

Mr. SPOONER. They assume that any knowledge is guilty knowledge.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes; they assume that any knowledge the President might have had of an expected or probable revolution in Panama would be guilty knowledge. But the insinuation and the veiled charges went further than that—that the President had been in consultation with parties who had been engaged in preparing the revolution; that he had known from time to time of the steps which were being taken to bring about that revolution; that he had countenanced it, connived at it, and was in fact in complicity with all that had been done by the persons who were preparing the revolution.

But I think that has gone by, Mr. President. Those charges,

direct and indirect, those insinuations, not indirect but direct, placed the President of the United States in a position which no President ought to be placed in. They put him in the position of having to plead not guilty, and he sent a message to Congress in which he denied any knowledge of the growing revolution which was not available to any individual who kept track of current events. I wish to read it, though in all my experience and in all my reading of the history of the United States I have never known such a charge brought against a President of the United States. I think the President is entitled to the confidence of the people of the United States until it has been shown that he is unworthy of that confidence. And I want to say one thing about the present Executive, that the people of the United States believe, and believe rightly, that he is honest, that he makes no attempt at concealment, and that he tries to do those things which, in the interest of the American people, he believes to be right. Whatever may be said about the President, that is the opinion which the people have formed of him.

It amounted, Mr. President, to little less than a national disgrace that the President should be charged, directly or indirectly, by insinuation or otherwise, with having been a party to the revolution on the Isthmus of Panama. But, as I said, he met that charge in a message which he sent to the Congress. I think if I had been the President of the United States I would not have done it. I think I would have rested my claim to the confidence of the American people as an honest, patriotic, and fearless President upon my actions and my character as the American people saw them and knew it. But the President said this to Congress:

I hesitate to refer to the injurious insinuations which have been made of complicity by this Government in the revolutionary movement in Panama. They are destitute of foundation as of propriety. The only excuse for my mentioning them is the fear lest unthinking persons might mistake for acquiescence the silence of mere self-respect. I think proper to say, therefore, that no one connected with this Government had any part in preparing, inciting, or encouraging the late revolution on the Isthmus of Panama, and that save from the reports of our military and naval officers, given above, no one connected with this Government had any previous knowledge of the revolution except such as was accessible to any person of ordinary intelligence who read the newspapers and kept up a current acquaintance with public affairs.

That meets the issue pretty squarely, Mr. President. I think it sets those insinuations at rest. It is true I have heard, even since that message of the President, insinuations that we have not got all the facts before us; that the Republican Senators know something which has been held back and concealed; that if the light were to be turned on there would be something shown which would prove that our Government was in complicity with the parties who were preparing and bringing about that revolution. But, Mr. President, I take the word of the President of the United States against any newspaper man in any article, signed or unsigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut will suspend one moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the Calendar of General Orders.

The SECRETARY. Order of Business 13—Senate bill 887.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that be laid aside informally.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the consideration of the resolution may proceed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. So, Mr. President, I think we may put this behind us.

But it is said that our naval forces ought not to have been sent to the Isthmus when a revolution was expected, not only by the Executive, but by everybody who had taken any pains to keep track of events. This whole contention, so far as the propriety of the action of this Government in the premises is concerned, seems to me to turn on the question whether we had a right to send naval vessels to the Isthmus when a revolution was imminent, when we knew it to be so, for the purpose of protecting the transit, the property, and the lives of American citizens.

Now, if we had that right, there has been nothing done in excess of that right; and therefore, for a few minutes—and I am not going to detain the Senate long—I wish to turn my attention to the question whether we had the right to protect the lives and property of American citizens on the Isthmus of Darien and to keep open the communication by rail over that isthmus from ocean to ocean.

Mr. President, if it were not for the supposed necessities of political parties I do not think the claim would ever have been made that this country had no such right. I claim that we had that right independent of any treaty. Much more did we have it with a treaty, the treaty of 1846. Further than that, I claim if the treaty had not confirmed us in this right, existing outside of the treaty, we would have had that right under the conditions which have arisen with reference to intercommunication between the oceans across that Isthmus.

Now, Mr. President, I lay down as a proposition here that

under the Constitution and under the laws and under the powers of the Executive, as its chief magistrate and as commander of its Army and its Navy, it is his duty, wherever the lives, liberties, and rights of American citizens are threatened in any foreign nation, to send there the protecting forces of the United States for the purpose of protecting those lives, those liberties, and those rights.

It does not seem to me as if at this period of our history we ought to be obliged to assert that doctrine in the Senate of the United States. It is as old as our Government, and its exercise dates back to the time when the founders of our Government were in control of its legislation and the direction of its affairs. It is a right exercised by every nation on earth. It is an inherent right of sovereignty in any nation.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me just a suggestion?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. On one occasion when our marines were landed to protect American interests on the Isthmus of Panama a British war ship landed her marines to protect British citizens on the Isthmus.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Of course, Mr. President. The nation that would not do that is not worthy of being called a nation. It is not worthy of a place among the nations. We have done it over and over again, and always with the approbation of the people of the United States. A President who would not do it would be justly condemned by all the people of this country.

Why, just think what we have done, and done recently. I have heard it said (I do not know that it has been said on the floor of the Senate, but it has been said by others in the discussion of this question) that the President could not send the Army out of the boundaries of our Government; that while possibly under the practice he might send naval vessels wherever there was danger to our citizens and their property, there was no law, no authority under the Constitution to send the Army out of the country for any such purpose, and that if the naval vessels with their complement of sailors and marines were not able to afford protection to the interests of American citizens on the Isthmus and to keep open the transit there he could not send the Army there for that purpose.

Mr. President, I want to refer to a recent instance in our history, an instance which I think is not eclipsed by any military operation in the history of the world, not excepting that great march of the British to the relief of Lucknow. Our legation in China was in peril; our missionaries there were being tortured and killed; their property rights were taken away from them, and the whole world believed that our legation and the legations of all the other nations there had been massacred—men, women, and children. We did not believe it. The President of the United States, President McKinley, exercised the right which he had of sending an armed expeditionary force for the relief of Peking, and in reading the accounts of that expedition and its results I think I am entitled to say that there is no brighter page, no more dramatic page, in the military annals of the world than that expedition of General Chaffee for the relief of our legation in Peking. In just seven weeks from the time he left Washington on the transport which carried the troops of the Army, meeting the troops sent from the Philippines and marching to the relief of Peking, he reported to Minister Conger and the lives of our citizens, the lives of our ministers, the lives of our missionaries were saved and protected.

Does any Senator tell me that President McKinley violated his constitutional obligations in doing that? And if he did not, President Roosevelt did not violate his constitutional obligations in sending our naval vessels, with their sailors and marines, into the waters where it was expected strife and bloodshed would put the lives of American citizens in peril and destroy their property.

In far-away Korea, in its capital, at this very hour an American marine force is guarding our legation from danger, and protecting from destruction a railroad built by American citizens and with American capital. We have no treaty which authorizes us to do this, but will Senators say that thereby the President has exceeded his constitutional power?

So I want to get back to this proposition: To maintain the contention which has been made in this case Senators must deny the right of the President to do that. Instance after instance in the history of this country might be cited.

I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] in his speech yesterday conceded that right, as every Senator must concede it. When those horrible atrocities were being perpetrated in Armenia—Christians, American Christians, slaughtered, massacred, all American property pillaged—is there any Senator or any individual in the United States who did not wish that we then had the power to send a naval force there and put an end to it in the interest of humanity as well as for the protection of our own citizens? But we did not have that force. Thank God, we

have it now, and if there is a recurrence of such events there the President of the United States, I think, would be recreant to his duty if he did not send a fleet there to protect our citizens, their lives, their liberties, and their property.

Now, then, having, as I think, made it clear that we had a right to send vessels to the Isthmus for that purpose, let us see whether that right was exercised in an improper manner. As I said before, it is a question as to what we have done there. We knew, everybody knew, that there was to be a revolution there, and we knew more, what revolutions on the Isthmus of Panama are and have been, having had some experience in that matter.

We knew that a revolution on the Isthmus of Panama meant fighting without the observance of the rules of civilized war; that it meant death to Americans; that it meant the destruction of American property; that it meant the shutting up of the passageway over that Isthmus between the oceans. Does anybody doubt that? We knew that from past revolutions there. We knew what a revolution there was and would be; the Government knew, and everybody knew that, except for the action of the United States Government, it would result in those consequences of which I have spoken.

Do I need to illustrate that? When the Colombian gunboat in the harbor of Panama, without notice to the inhabitants, shelled the city, and when all the consuls of all the nations united in a protest against such action, the President knew that such a revolution was impending. He knew, or he ought to have known, the consequences, and he did know what the consequences would be. He sent there some naval vessels; I do not now recall just how many; perhaps three or four, but four, I think, two at Colon and two at Panama. Senators complain of that. They say we had no right to do it; that the President had no right to do it. I wonder what they would have said if he had not done it. I wonder what they would have said if he had declined or refused to do it.

Is this the claim they make; that we must sit idly by and allow the Colombian Government to interrupt that transit; allow the Colombian Government to attack American citizens; allow it to interfere with the world's trade across that Isthmus? Is that the claim? Some things that have been said seeming to assert that we had no right to protect the line of communication across the Isthmus; that we had accepted in the treaty of 1846 the guaranty of Colombia that she would do it; that there our right ended, and that, no matter what might be the result, no matter how many lives of American citizens might be sacrificed and how much of their property destroyed, how much of the commerce of the world interrupted, we must sit idly by and let Colombia take care of it.

So I come, Mr. President, to this proposition: We had the right to do this independently of any treaty which we had with Colombia—a right inherent in the sovereignty of a nation, and without the exercise of which when occasion demands, no nation would be fit to be called a nation.

What had we there, Mr. President? Suppose, for the time being, in arguing this question, we forget we had a treaty; we forget that a canal across that Isthmus was talked about; what had we there? We had a railroad joining the two oceans, fifty years or more old, built by a New York corporation, built with American capital, officered by American citizens, over which were passing from day to day and week to week the goods of the American people. Does anybody say that under those circumstances this Government ought not to have used every effort for the protection of that line of transit against interruption?

So I say, primarily, without any treaty and without any question of a canal, this Government was justified in sending a naval force there to protect our interests, and, more than that, to protect the interests of the whole world in that transit. It would have been recreant to its duty if it had not done it, and the outcry we now hear against the Government for having done it would be but an evening zephyr compared with the cyclone of denunciation that we would have heard from the other side of the Chamber if it had not been done.

Submit that question to the American people, put it in concrete form—Ought the President to have refrained from sending our war ships to the Isthmus of Panama for the protection of the lives of our people and their interests there when he knew that a revolution, which would be bloody, was about to be inaugurated?—and see what the verdict would be. It would be no party question; it would be a question about which there would not be any considerable contention.

What did the President do? We had this knowledge. They say we ought not to have had it. We knew that there was every probability that there would be a revolution there. The *Nashville* went to Colon; it found there some Colombian troops which had been landed there the day previously. Did it interfere with those troops? Did it say to them that they must leave the Isthmus? No. What was done? The commander of the *Nashville* said to them that he could not permit their transportation over

the railroad to Panama, as a revolution had broken out. Did he do anything more than had been done before by our Government, and with the approbation of the people? Time and again the transportation of Colombian troops across that line of railroad, where a conflict would be likely to occur, had been prevented, except upon condition that their arms were surrendered and that they were accompanied by United States guards to see that no conflict ensued there.

But the revolution had broken out at Panama, and Colonel Torres, I think it was, when he learned that the troops could not be transported to Panama to inaugurate a conflict, became very angry and threatened to massacre every American citizen on the Isthmus.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. May I interrupt the Senator to ask him on what authority he makes that statement?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Not on any newspaper authority. I take it from official documents, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. You take it from Hubbard's report, I suppose.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do.

Mr. TELLER. There is no other authority for it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, Mr. President, has it come to this, that when the President of the United States says he has not been guilty of complicity in a revolution we are to be told that there is no other authority for it; that when the captain commanding one of our naval vessels makes a report upon a transaction we are to be told that there is no other authority for it? I do not put it that way. The Senator did not say that Commander Hubbard was not to be believed, but that there was no other authority for it. The inference can be drawn by anyone. I think I will read this. It will take me a little more time than I had anticipated giving to the discussion of this subject if I read from official documents, but as we are upon what was done I think it is well enough to read the report of the commander of the *Nashville*. He says that the occurrences in connection with the Colombian troops in Colon during the three days amounted to practically making war against the United States.

We have been told here that we made war on Colombia. Perhaps because Commander Hubbard disagrees with the opinions of Senators who hold that and thinks that Colombia made war on the United States, he is not to be credited in his report as he would otherwise be:

At 1 o'clock p. m. on that date I was summoned on shore by a preconcerted signal, and on landing met the United States consul, vice-consul, and Colonel Shaler, the general superintendent of the Panama Railroad. The consul informed me that he had received notice from the officer commanding the Colombian troops, Colonel Torres, through the prefect of Colon, to the effect that if the Colombian officers, Generals Tobal and Amaya, who had been seized in Panama on the evening of the 3d of November by the independents and held as prisoners, were not released by 2 o'clock p. m. he, Torres, would open fire on the town of Colon and kill every United States citizen in the place, and my advice and action were requested.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] in his address on yesterday said that the governor, who is called here the prefect, of Colon was a mulatto and a fat man, and that, after having been informed by Colonel Torres that if those generals over in Panama were not released by 2 o'clock he would open fire upon the American citizens there, he ran as fast as he could to communicate the information to the commander of the *Nashville*.

Well, Mr. President, what of that? Does being a mulatto or a fat man or his running to send word to the commander of the *Nashville* take away from the dignity or the necessity of his act? I really did not see the pertinence of it; but the Senator from Colorado seemed to think that in some way it threw some shadow or some cloud over these transactions that the prefect was a mulatto, a fat man, and that he ran as fast as he could to communicate the information to the commander of the *Nashville* that American citizens were in danger of fire being opened upon them and every life at Colon, at that end of the Isthmus, being sacrificed.

I advised that all the United States citizens should take refuge in the shed of the Panama Railroad Company, a stone building susceptible of being put into good state for defense, and that I would immediately land such body of men, with extra arms for arming the citizens, as the complement of the ship would permit. This was agreed to and I immediately returned on board arriving at 1.15 p. m. The order for landing was immediately given, and at 1.30 p. m. the boats left the ship with a party of—

How many?

forty-two men—

There were 475 of those Colombian troops under the command of Colonel Torres threatening to kill American citizens there, unless we took part in favor of Colombia against the revolutionists and required them to release the generals whom they had imprisoned at Panama. Forty-two men! I will say, Mr. President,

that that was one of the gallant acts which our Navy is so often performing—42 men ready to face an infuriated 475, who wanted the blood and the lives of American citizens. Will anybody deny that Colonel Torres made that threat? I have not heard it denied—

forty-two men under the command of Lieut. Commander H. M. Witzel, with Midshipman J. P. Jackson as second in command. Time being pressing I gave verbal orders to Mr. Witzel to take the building above referred to, to put it into the best state of defense possible, and protect the lives of the citizens assembled there—not firing unless fired upon.

What a wicked thing in the estimation of Senators!

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will, if he does not detain me too long.

Mr. TILLMAN. Would it be straining the imagination of the Senator if I were to ask him whether this belligerent attitude, the threatening demeanor, followed so soon after by the embarkation after Colonel Torres had received the money, was not in the nature of a kind of dicker or a badgering attitude in order to increase the price that they were to pay him?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is an accomplished debater. Whenever he sees that a point made is pressing home upon a contention of the other side, he rises with his rapier and proceeds to attack in another quarter. I want to exercise my Yankee privilege by asking him a question. Does the Senator think that Commander Hubbard, with his force of forty-two men under Lieutenant-Commander Witzel and Midshipman Jackson, had anything whatever to do with buying up the Colombian troops or their officers?

Mr. TILLMAN. I answer unhesitatingly, No.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No?

Mr. TILLMAN. But wait, now, please. May I ask another question?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I suppose the Senator wants to ask a question for the purpose of shifting this debate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Not at all. I like to hear the Senator from Connecticut. He speaks about adroit rapiers and all that sort of thing, but he uses a keen sword himself sometimes, and I enjoy a little passage at arms with almost anybody when I am in the humor. The point that I would like light on before he gets through is whether or not the American consul did not furnish the money to pay for the withdrawal of those troops.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I answer, No; there is no evidence of that in relation to the American consul, not even newspaper evidence of it. It has been charged in the newspapers that the vice-consul there, who is not an American citizen—

Mr. TILLMAN. I am speaking of Ehrman. Is he the consul or vice-consul?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The vice-consul.

Mr. TILLMAN. All right; then just transfer the question to the vice-consul.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator has his newspaper authority for it, but I have never seen any other authority for it. There is nothing in the official dispatches to that effect, and if there was there is nothing to involve this Government in complicity with the revolution or its means of accomplishment by the fact that the vice-consul, not a citizen of the United States, but appointed from the territory itself, may have done some act of that sort. I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. SPOONER. It has been said that he was a stockholder in a bank, out of which they paid some money on the demand—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. One thing more—

Mr. TILLMAN. One moment, please. Let us not get away from this point.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I want to answer the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of course, I have to submit to his pleasure.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator may ask all these questions, and I will submit patiently to their being asked, but he will not divert me from the point to which I am speaking—

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not desire to divert the Senator at all.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. To notice inconsequential matters relating to this revolution in Panama.

I was reading from the report of Commander Hubbard that he had directed the officer in charge of these forty-two men to make the best defense possible "and protect the lives of the citizens assembled there, not firing unless fired upon."

Does the Senator from South Carolina make any objection to that?

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I confess that it is hardly fair for the Senator to turn to me in that manner, after having refused to allow me to progress along the line that I was pursuing—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If it is unfair—

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to say this, if the Senator will permit me, right now—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I apologize for it if it is unfair.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to say that, with the *Nashville* off shore, coming in close with its machine guns, ready to sweep those 442 men—and everybody else that might have been in the way—off the face of the earth, I do not think there was ever very great danger.

However, I give due credit to the American officers and marines—the forty-two men who were there to do their duty and obey orders and yield up their lives, if necessary. Our Navy needs no defense, and I am not attacking it. I am only casting a few side lights and some little reflections and criticisms upon the manner in which the Republic of Panama was born; and I will ask the Senator now, while I am on my feet, if he does deny that Colonel Black, of the United States Engineers, furnished the flag and helped to raise it?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will answer that question by asking another. Does the Senator from South Carolina think if an officer no longer in the regular service, but detailed to civilian duty, happened to assist in the raising of a flag after the revolution had been thoroughly accomplished, that that commits our Government to participation in the revolution? I do not think he will say it does.

Mr. TILLMAN. Oh, we will never get the evidence as to the participation of our Government except from the message of the President himself in his recital of the events preceding the warning given Colombia of the preparation of this Government by sending naval vessels there. All of the incidental testimony, the circumstantial evidence, I will say, is along the line of proof to any person who is not committed in his own heart and mind to a denial of it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. To any person who is determined that the Panama Canal shall not be built and that the Nicaragua Canal shall be.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want a canal, and I want one at Panama, provided we do not have to steal it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, the insinuation of that last remark is what I complain of. I do not think the Senator from South Carolina, or any other Senator in his sober second thought, when his judgment prevails against what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] so characteristically spoke of—prevails against the blood in his head—will make such insinuations.

But I am reading the report of Commander Hubbard, and I am going to read it through, no matter how many interruptions there may be. I know it is not agreeable to the Senators who are determined to find fault in this matter:

The women and children took refuge on the German steamer *Marcomania*—

The women and the children were thought to be in danger. The Senator from South Carolina thinks there was no danger, but they went aboard a foreign steamer—

and Panama Railroad steamer *City of Washington*, both ready to haul out from dock if necessary. The *Nashville* I got under way and patrolled with her along the water front close in and ready to use either small-arm or shrapnel fire.

If he had not done it he should have been cashiered. Let us see whether there was any danger.

The Colombians surrounded the building of the railroad company almost immediately after we had taken possession, and for about one and a half hours their attitude was most threatening, it being seemingly their purpose to provoke an attack. Happily our men were cool and steady, and while the tension was very great no shot was fired.

I do not know that I care to quote further from this dispatch, except where he says:

I am positive that the determined attitude of our men, their coolness and evident intention of standing their ground, had a most salutary and decisive effect on the immediate situation and was the initial step in the ultimate abandoning of Colon by these troops and their return to Cartagena the following day. Lieutenant-Commander Witzel is entitled to much praise for his admirable work in command on the spot.

The Senator from South Carolina seems to think that the reason they left was because somebody paid them to leave. Commander Hubbard says that the cool and determined attitude of our men "was the initial step in the ultimate abandoning of Colon by these troops and their return to Cartagena the following day."

I wish to quote one sentence from his more formal subsequent dispatch. I know there is nobody's word for this except that of Commander Hubbard. I suppose it will not be believed on the other side of the Chamber, because there is not corroborative testimony. Has it come to this, Mr. President, that a naval officer must furnish corroborative testimony of the truth of the matter which he states in his official report?

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to say, once for all, that I have not the slightest hesitancy in giving full credence to all statements that Commander Hubbard makes. I believe he is an honorable gentleman and an officer of the United States Navy doing his duty as he understands it, and obeying orders.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is anything wrong with what was done under the orders? The question is what we have done.

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, I want to ask the Senator this: Where is there any authority, by treaty or otherwise, constitutional or lawful, to forbid Colombia to land troops within 50 miles of Panama? That is one of the orders.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is plenty of reason for it. I do not shirk that question; I will come to it by and by.

In his second and more formal dispatch Commander Hubbard says:

I beg to assure the Department that I had no part whatever in the negotiations that were carried on between Colonel Torres and the representatives of the provisional government.

I think his word might be taken for that.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I should like to say this—

Mr. TILLMAN. Is not that corroborative testimony that somebody did buy Torres off, and that Commander Hubbard knew it?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Suppose they did. Was there ever a revolution inaugurated in the world where every means to make it successful was not resorted to? And what bearing has that on the question whether or not the revolution was successful? There is nothing in this dispatch to show it.

I want to commence and read it over again. I hope the Senator will let me read this through.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will put it in verbatim, literatim, seriatim.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will read it:

I beg to assure the Department that I had no part whatever in the negotiations that were carried on between Colonel Torres and the representatives of the provisional government; that I landed an armed force only when the lives of American citizens were threatened, and withdrew this force as soon as there seemed to be no grounds for further apprehension of injury to American lives or property; that I relanded an armed force because of the failure of Colonel Torres to carry out his agreement to withdraw and announced intention of returning, and that my attitude throughout was strictly neutral as between the two parties, my only purpose being to protect the lives and property of American citizens and to preserve the free and uninterrupted transit of the Isthmus.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, if the Senator will allow me, I have understood or heard it said that people who are on the lookout for slights feel their inferiority and that people who are suspicious are more or less to be watched. Why should Commander Hubbard deny something in advance if he did not expect that the charge would be made, directly or indirectly, that he was there for the business of setting up this Republic?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am dealing with facts.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to ask the Senator to permit me to add a word.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let me finish this sentence. I am dealing with facts. The Senator from South Carolina seems to be dealing with insinuations.

Mr. TILLMAN. Insinuations constitute a very good weapon sometimes, when they have point.

What I wish to add comes from one of the poets:

The lady doth protest too much, methinks.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have demonstrated, I think, that, independent of the treaty, and because of the fact that we not only had, under charge of an American corporation, an open transit across that Isthmus, but because of the fact that other nations looked to us to guard their interests in keeping it open, we had a perfect right to do everything that has been done. It is idle, and it is pitiful, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina, to seek to evade the plain facts developed on official documents and to try to charge something improper by insinuation and suspicion and guesswork. When the American Senate gets to legislating by guess it will have lost the well-earned reputation that it has for dealing with facts and legislating upon facts.

Mr. President, we have that primary right. Second, we had, under the treaty of 1846, the cumulative right to protect that Isthmus and that transit free and uninterrupted in its use. If I understand the contention of Senators on the other side—not all of them, but of those who see fit to attack the conduct of the President in this matter—their contention may be stated in this way, and it is well sometimes to avoid legal terms and legal quibbles and to state an issue or contention in plain, good, simple English. I understand the contention which has been made on the other side that we had no right to protect that Isthmus to be just this: That under the treaty of 1846 we accepted a guaranty from New Granada that she should protect that transit, and therefore we not only had no right to protect it ourselves, but Colombia had the right to come and interrupt it. That is a fair

statement of the contention. The statement itself answers the contention.

We did not surrender this primary right which we had to protect our own property, a greater and more important property than we had anywhere else in the world outside of our own borders; the primary, inherent right of a government to protect its property and the lives and liberty of its citizens in foreign lands—we did not surrender that when there was written into the treaty of 1846 that Colombia would guarantee an uninterrupted transit there. We asked Colombia to do it. But who asserts that we surrendered our right to do it, whether Colombia did it or not, if it was necessary in order to protect the free and uninterrupted use of that transit?

Certainly, Mr. President, the obligation of Colombia to protect the transit did not give her any right to interrupt it and shut it up or to take any steps which would result in the closing of it. I can not understand how a lawyer can claim that by accepting that provision in the treaty of 1846, by not protesting against it, we lost our primary right, our indefeasible, inherent right to protect that communication, and, more than that, that it gave Colombia the right to shut it up if occasion arose for her to fight on the line of the railroad.

Mr. President, we did what we had a right to do. We protected the isthmian transit. We protected the lives of American citizens. We protected the property of American citizens, and we said that Colombia should not interfere with those rights. That is all we said. We did not help the revolutionists. We took no part in aiding them; but under that treaty we had the right, existing before the treaty, to extend protection to our property and to our citizens there, and if Colombia came there for a fight which would interrupt that transit and destroy the lives of our citizens and their property, and we prevented their doing it, and revolution ensued and independence became an accomplished fact, that was simply an incident of the situation which Colombia was bound to accept. It can not be contended with any show of reason that because Colombia wrote into the treaty, and we accepted it, that she would protect that Isthmus and the use of it from interruption we lost our right or surrendered our right to do it ourselves and gave her the right to close the transit by conflict.

And now, Mr. President, except for the political necessities of this case the question never would have been made. In the years that have gone by the result of our action on the Isthmus, the action of our marines and our troops, I think, certainly our marines, has prevented the Panamanians from accomplishing their independence. If, as an incident, they were enabled to secure their independence because we would not permit that transit to be interrupted that was their good fortune, as it was the good fortune of Colombia that in previous years while protecting the Isthmus we had prevented the Panamanians from accomplishing their independence. But I said it never would have been made but for the necessities of the case.

I wish to read what some Democratic Presidents have said on this subject long before there was any thought of a canal there. Franklin Pierce, in 1854, in his second annual message to Congress, referring to the Isthmus, said:

Convenient means of transit between the several parts of a country are not only desirable for the objects of commercial and personal communication, but essential to its existence under one government. Separated as are the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the United States by the whole breadth of the continent, still the inhabitants of each are closely bound together by community of origin and institutions and by strong attachment to the Union. Hence the constant and increasing intercourse and vast interchange of commercial productions between these remote divisions of the Republic. At the present time the most practicable and only commodious routes for communication between them are by the way of the Isthmus of Central America. It is the duty of the Government to secure these avenues against all danger of interruption.

Mr. President, there was no railroad there then. There were a variety of routes across that country, some of which had been granted by concessions and some of which were used without concessions. The treaty of 1846 had been concluded ten years and no railroad and no canal was there, and Franklin Pierce said it was "the duty of the Government to secure these avenues against all danger of interruption." He would have been told by Senators on the other side that Colombia had agreed in the treaty to keep open uninterruptedly the use of these routes and the United States had nothing to do with it. It was good Democratic doctrine in 1854 that it was the duty of the Government, not the right of the Government, but "the duty of the Government to secure these avenues against all danger of interruption."

Let us go along a little further with our Democratic Presidents. Again, in 1856, when the railroad had been opened, it having been opened in 1855, I think, he said:

The present condition of the Isthmus of Panama in so far as regards the security of persons and property passing over it requires serious consideration. Recent incidents tend to show that the local authorities can not be relied on to maintain the public peace of Panama, and there is just ground for apprehension that a portion of the inhabitants are meditating further outrages, without adequate measures for the security and protection of persons

or property having been taken, either by the State of Panama or by the General Government of New Granada.

Under the guaranties of treaty, citizens of the United States have, by the outlay of several million dollars, constructed a railroad across the Isthmus, and it has become the main route between our Atlantic and Pacific possessions, over which multitudes of our citizens and a vast amount of property are constantly passing, to the security and protection of all which and the continuance of the public advantages involved it is impossible for the Government of the United States to be indifferent.

Now listen to this:

I have deemed the danger of the recurrence of scenes of lawless violence in this quarter so imminent as to make it my duty to station a part of our naval force in the harbors of Panama and Aspinwall in order to protect the persons and property of the citizens of the United States in those ports and to insure to them safe passage across the Isthmus.

Aspinwall is Colon now. I wonder what our Democratic friends, who are so bitter against the action of the President, would have said when Franklin Pierce sent that message to Congress and told them that the danger of the recurrence of outbreaks there was so great that he had sent naval vessels of the United States into the ports of Panama and Colon "to protect the persons and property of citizens of the United States in those ports and to insure to them safe passage across the Isthmus?"

When he said that in that message, would any Democratic Senator have risen and said the President had violated all of his constitutional obligations; that he had no business to do it; that we had agreed to leave the guarding and protection of that interest to Colombia, and until we found that either Colombia did not intend to do it or was not able to do it we had no business to start a ship in the direction of Colon or Panama, no matter how great the danger to the lives of our citizens or how great was the danger to the interruption of transit?

But I come to another Democratic President, James Buchanan. I do not think the Senator from Tennessee even would say that James Buchanan was a "President with blood in his head, who thought with his blood rather than with his brains." In his first annual message, under date of December 8, 1857, President James Buchanan says:

The Isthmus of Central America, including that of Panama, is the great highway between the Atlantic and Pacific, over which a large portion of the commerce of the world is destined to pass. The United States are more deeply interested than any other nation in preserving the freedom and security of all the communications across this Isthmus. It is our duty, therefore, to take care that they shall not be interrupted either by invasions from our own country or by wars between the independent states of Central America.

Under our treaty with New Granada of the 12th of December, 1846, we are bound to guarantee the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama, through which the Panama Railroad passes, "as well as the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory." This obligation is founded upon equivalents granted by the treaty to the Government and people of the United States.

Under these circumstances I recommend to Congress the passage of an act authorizing the President, in case of necessity, to employ the land and naval forces of the United States to carry into effect this guaranty of neutrality and protection. I also recommend similar legislation for the security of any other route across the Isthmus in which we may acquire an interest by treaty.

Let us see what James Buchanan thought about a similar condition, on all fours with this condition except there had been no prior treaty.

He had negotiated with Nicaragua a treaty, on the 16th day of November, 1857, under the stipulations of which the use and the protection of the transit route had been secured not only to the United States but to all other nations.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator give the page? It is volume 5, is it not?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Page 516, volume 5. Mr. Buchanan, having no treaty route across Nicaragua, had negotiated a treaty providing for such communication, not only to the United States but equally to all other nations. Nicaragua failed to ratify it, just as Colombia failed to ratify the Hay-Herran treaty, and President Buchanan proceeded to say:

How and on what pretext this treaty has failed to receive the ratification of the Nicaraguan Government will appear by the papers herewith communicated from the State Department. The principal objection seems to have been to the provision authorizing the United States to employ force to keep the route open in case Nicaragua should fail to perform her duty in this respect.

Democratic Senators would have told President Buchanan that it was perfectly right for Nicaragua to reject the treaty upon that ground; that if she did not want the United States to use force to keep it open, that was her business and she had a right to do it. The President goes on to say:

From the feebleness of that Republic, its frequent changes of Government, and its constant internal dissensions this had become a most important stipulation, and one essentially necessary, not only for the security of the route, but for the safety of American citizens passing and repassing to and from our Pacific possessions. Were such a stipulation embraced in a treaty between the United States and Nicaragua the knowledge of this fact would of itself most probably prevent hostile parties from committing aggressions on the route and render our actual interference for its protection unnecessary.

Now, the President says something relating to his lack of power to which I can not agree:

The Executive Government of this country in its intercourse with foreign nations is limited to the employment of diplomacy alone. When this fails it can proceed no further. It can not legitimately resort to force without the

direct authority of Congress, except in resisting and repelling hostile attacks. It would have no authority to enter the territories of Nicaragua even to prevent the destruction of the transit and protect the lives and property of our own citizens on their passage. It is true that on a sudden emergency of this character the President would direct any armed force in the vicinity to march to their relief, but in doing this he would act upon his own responsibility.

Under these circumstances I earnestly recommend to Congress the passage of an act authorizing the President, under such restrictions as they may deem proper, to employ the land and naval forces of the United States in preventing the transit from being obstructed or closed by lawless violence, and in protecting the lives and property of American citizens traveling thereupon, requiring at the same time that these forces shall be withdrawn the moment the danger shall have passed away. Without such a provision our citizens will be constantly exposed to interruption in their progress and into lawless violence. A similar necessity exists for the passage of such an act for the protection of the Panama and Tehuantepec routes.

With the treaty of 1846, with no right under it to protect the Panama route, yet President Buchanan asked Congress to allow him to employ the naval and military forces of the United States to protect the Panama route; and as to Nicaragua, there was no treaty. One had been negotiated, and Nicaragua would not ratify it. President Buchanan, under the impression that he could not of his own motion, except upon taking the responsibility, as Andrew Jackson once said, use the naval and land forces to protect the route, asked Congress to empower him.

And a President of the United States, James Buchanan by name, a Democrat of Democrats, sends a message to Congress, where he had made a treaty with Nicaragua, as we have made a treaty with Colombia, and where Nicaragua failed to ratify it, as Colombia failed to ratify it, and where he speaks of the pretext upon which Nicaragua failed to ratify it being communicated in the papers, yet asks Congress to permit him to use the Army and Navy to keep open that route and protect the lives and property of our citizens.

I wonder what Senators would have said to James Buchanan when he sent in here a message of that sort. Would he have been told that he had violated all the obligations of the Constitution, all the canons of international law, because he had asked Congress to authorize him to use the Army and the Navy to keep that route clear from interruption?

Mr. President, I may not dwell on this. I dislike to take up so much time. I think the time for action rather than discussion has arrived. But there is one other ground. You may call it what you please. You may call it the international law of eminent domain, although that is a misnomer. It has nothing to do with the law of eminent domain.

But when the governments owning that strip of land across which the world has decreed the canal shall pass say "no," and hedge it about with impossible stipulations—to use a phrase of the time and of the street, "strike" for more money, hold up the negotiations—there is reason for saying that the time will come when, if that canal can be built in no other way, the United States, as the trustee for the nations of the world, will do it with the strong arm; and I think the message of the President is entirely justified in that respect.

I had intended, Mr. President, to say a word about recognition. I deny that any of the principles laid down by international law writers have been violated in the recognition of Panama. Recognition depends upon the circumstances of each particular case. There were precedents for it. I am not going to consume the time of the Senate in rehearsing them. They were ably set forth by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. But precedent or no precedent, the recognition of the Republic of Panama has passed into the international law of this world as a justifiable act.

How are the principles and canons of international law laid down? By the consensus of the powers of the world as to what is just and right and honorable as between nations, as the statute law determines what is just and right and honorable between individuals. It does not lie in the mouths of Senators to say, after these eighteen or twenty nations have looked into the case and in recognizing the new Republic of Panama have said that such recognition is justifiable and right and moral, that any principle of international law has been violated or any precedent has been violated.

If there was no precedent for it before, that precedent has now been written into the international law of the world. There never was a case like it. There probably never will be a case like it. But given, in the territory of a government, the essential and necessary passageway of a canal to join the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, a canal along which the commerce of the world is going to pass for the benefit of mankind, for the benefit of civilization; given another condition, that a treaty has been negotiated between two governments, the Government of the United States and the nation in control of that Isthmus, for the right to build that canal by the United States and in the interest of all nations. Given another fact. If that treaty had been rejected because, as the records show, it was thought by Colombia that more money could be obtained out of the United States; because, as the records show, it was thought by a Colombian committee of its Senate that

shortly the time would arrive when the property of the new Panama Canal Company could be confiscated and become the property of the Colombian Government and then sold to the United States—given all these conditions, and the further condition that Colombia was notified by Panama that if the treaty was rejected Panama would establish an independent government, and that the act of which notice had been given had been carried out, that Panama had become independent to the extent that its people and all its people consented to the new government, that the doctrine of the consent of the governed had been observed—given that case, these conditions, and who shall say that with that new State ready and willing to give to the United States the right to construct this great enterprise across its territory there was anything unjustifiable, improper, or wrong in its recognition?

No, Mr. President; Colombia had the right, technically, to reject that treaty, but she did it at her peril. If, when she had been told that if she rejected it the result would be the secession of Panama and the establishment of an independent state, she chose to persist in her rejection, she acted with notice; she has no right to complain. She has no longer any ground of complaint against the United States. She did it with her eyes open. She rejected it when she had reason to know, as all the world knew, that the result of it would be a revolution in Panama, an accomplished independence, a treaty of Panama with the United States to build that canal. What right has she to complain? What right has she to say that we have done her a wrong? None; none whatever.

Mr. President, I wish to say one word about this act of the recognition of Panama as the act of the Executive of the United States. He has the power to recognize new states. It is given to him by the Constitution. No man can say that in exercising it he violates the Constitution. He exercises a constitutional right which is committed to him. Was it proper or required that he should wait and wait until a constitutional convention had been called, and a legislature established, and courts established before he recognized the new republic?

The only test which really exists in any case existed in this case, making it proper to recognize the new government, the assent of its people—the entire, unanimous acquiescence in what was done, and the fact that there was at that time no show of force on the part of the parent government to reduce it to subjection.

Do I say that there was an acquiescence of the people? It is shown in the dispatch of Secretary Hay, when he informed the Colombian Government that we had recognized it. It has been shown since in the documents transmitted to the Senate, in which every municipality in the whole territory of Panama has met and ratified that act of revolution.

It was a great act, Mr. President. It was an act which, for all time to come, must affect, and affect, I believe, most beneficially, the United States of America. The President was equal to the occasion. Brave and fearless as he is, but neither rash nor impetuous, he did the right thing at the right time; the thing which will insure the building of that canal, so long delayed; the thing which will contribute to the future prosperity of this country.

Mr. President, no great executive act of any President which contributed to the growth and glory of this country has ever been performed without a violent, vicious, vituperative attack upon the President who performed it. From the days of George Washington to the days of Theodore Roosevelt, whenever any President has had the courage to do what he ought to do in reference to foreign countries he has been assailed as the present Executive is assailed. The Jay treaty, the Louisiana purchase, the Florida purchase or settlement, the acquisition of the Philippines, all have called down upon the heads of the Presidents who have taken the responsibility and done those great acts the coarsest calumny, the most unsparing vituperation.

But, Mr. President, as time goes on and the benefits of the act are discovered criticism fades away; the abuse is forgotten except as it is regretted; the act stands out to the glory of the President who performed it.

Mr. President, the hope of the nations, the dream of the ages, is about to be realized. We will ratify this treaty; we will build the canal; and when the ships of the whole earth, with their great cargoes, are passing through it these criticisms, these attacks, these vituperations will be forgotten; and whatever President Roosevelt has done during this Administration or may do in any future one, this act of his will stand forth before the world as the greatest act of his Administration, the act which has conferred more benefit upon the United States and the world than any other act which he could be called upon to perform.

Mr. TELLER obtained the floor.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask the permission of the Senator from Colorado to occupy the floor for a minute.

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. At this very point, and in connection with the very severe castigation and lecture we on this side have received

from the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], I wish to indulge in a slight reminiscence and reproduction of a little ancient history.

The Senator has been quoting from Democratic sources and I want to quote from some Democratic sources, too. It would be very interesting if I should read the whole document, but I shall read only a small extract from the famous Ostend manifesto. I shall ask permission, and I ask it now, lest I forget, to insert it in full.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. Here is the part I want to read, however, and I ask the Senator from Connecticut to please give me his attention. I will say, by way of brief explanation, that three of the ministers of the United States Government representing this country in Europe had been practically instructed by Mr. Marcy, then Secretary of State under Pierce's Administration, to confer on this subject and announce their conclusion. It was in regard to the then wish or desire of this country to possess Cuba. These ministers met and issued what is known in our history as the "Ostend manifesto," because they met at Ostend, in Belgium. The phraseology that I wish to read just here—and I hope the Senator will not leave the Chamber—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No, I am not leaving.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is this:

Our past history forbids that we should acquire the Island of Cuba without the consent of Spain, unless justified by the great law of self-preservation. We must, in any event, preserve our own conscious rectitude and our own self-respect.

"Rectitude and self-respect!"

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Self-preservation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Self-respect. I stand by the word as these Democrats wrote it.

Whilst pursuing this course we can afford to disregard the censures of the world, to which we have been so often and so unjustly exposed.

Just as we are now.

After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value and this shall have been refused—

Just as Colombia refused—

It will then be time to consider the question, Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union?

Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power; and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home.

Now, this sounds so familiar and so much like the germ, the source, the fountain of the arguments of our President in his dealings with Colombia; I see so much that is familiar here—not the words, but the ideas, though the fact that this was Democratic doctrine in 1856, while the doctrine now announced is Republican doctrine in 1904, should make a difference—that I really wonder that history is repeating itself and that, without regard to parties, we Americans are disposed to look out for the main chance and then salve our consciences with all sorts of reasons why what we do is respectable and honest.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Does the Senator repudiate the doctrine of Buchanan?

Mr. TILLMAN. It is here. I want to read for the Senator's benefit what his party, the recently organized Republican party, had to say about it.

Mr. SPOONER. What do you think about it?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is another matter; but if the Senator wants my opinion, I think it was the doctrine of the wolf, as enunciated by Æsop three thousand years ago, which said to the lamb: "It does not matter whether the stream runs up or down, or whether you are above or below me, but I want you for supper." That is what I think about it, and no man need ask me further as to my opinion as to whether it was fair or honest. It was simply greedy and dirty and dishonorable—unworthy any man or party or people!

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How does it agree with the doctrine which I understood him to announce the other day—that he would say to Colombia, under certain circumstances, "You mangy cur, get out of the way?"

Mr. TILLMAN. I said without indorsing that idea I would have preferred that we had pursued the policy of the bold highwayman rather than that of the sneak thief, and I repeat it. It is the doctrine of the highwayman, and I will give my authority for calling it such. I read from the Republican platform of 1856:

Resolved, The highwayman's plea that "might makes right," embodied in the Ostend circular, was in every respect unworthy of American diplomacy and would bring shame and dishonor upon any government or people that gave it their sanction.

The American people did not give it their sanction, and the Democratic party did not dare to indorse it.

Mr. FULTON. That party which denounced it was beaten.

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, but it was victorious four years later on

other issues, and no one can deny that its brave denunciation of such an infamous programme gave it the confidence of the people. The party that announces the doctrine now will be beaten, too, if the American people have not gone to sleep and lost all sense of self-respect, honor, and decency. That is why we are endeavoring to open up this question and get the facts. We can not convict you on the evidence so far presented of having stolen the Isthmus. The circumstances and admissions of the President show it to all honest men. I had better not be too sweeping. I will say that all honest men who are not partisans must acknowledge that our Government has stolen it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TILLMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Then why undertake to make a charge here in the Senate of the suppression or concealment of facts or that those know any facts—

Mr. TILLMAN. I can only make this charge: Our efforts to get a resolution through here calling for documents and papers have failed; and we were told the other day by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that this is a Republican pie and you intend to cook it to suit yourselves, and that we of the minority could eat it or not as we liked, because you have the votes and you propose to run this policy over us roughshod.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think there has been any disposition to conceal facts. I think there has been an attempt made to carry such an idea, but I do not think there is any disposition to conceal facts in any manner.

Mr. TILLMAN. It remains to be seen as to whether the resolution, which I understand has been offered or will be offered, going into the particulars as to what we want will be passed by the Senate, and then whether we will have a repetition of our experience in the Philippine business, being told that it was not expedient, according to the wisdom of the Secretary of War or the Executive, to furnish them.

Mr. CULLOM. We are ready to pass the Gorman resolution now.

Mr. TILLMAN. I can say that it has not been our fault on this side that it has not been passed long ago, and this discussion need never have been entered into if it had not been for the opposition on the other side and the evident purpose to smother, cloak, hide, and conceal.

But I did not get up to make any speech. I merely wanted to revive some reminiscences; and as my friend has been dealing in Democratic precedents, I wanted to call his attention and refresh his memory about a famous and an infamous proposition which the American people repudiated once and are now asked to indorse.

I say it was on all fours with the present condition, that the doctrine we are now following is that might makes right, that we are the agents of civilization and of advancing commerce, and all that kind of thing, and that is the reason why we are following this course.

As I have already had permission to publish the Ostend manifesto in full, I put in this extract from the Republican platform of 1856 alongside it to let our country see how we stood then, how we stand now, and let us find out at the election in November whether the people propose to repudiate this doctrine as they did then.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OSTEND MANIFESTO.

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, October 18, 1856.

SIR: The undersigned, in compliance with the wish expressed by the President in the several confidential dispatches you have addressed to us, respectively, to that effect, have met in conference, first at Ostend, in Belgium, on the 9th, 10th, and 11th instant, and then at Aix-la-Chapelle, in Prussia, on the days next following, up to the date hereof.

There has been a full and unreserved interchange of views and sentiments between us, which we are most happy to inform you has resulted in a cordial coincidence of opinion on the grave and important subjects submitted to our consideration.

We have arrived at the conclusion and are thoroughly convinced that an immediate and earnest effort ought to be made by the Government of the United States to purchase Cuba from Spain at any price for which it can be obtained, not exceeding the sum of \$—.

The proposal should, in our opinion, be made in such a manner as to be presented through the necessary diplomatic forms to the supreme constituent Cortes about to assemble. On this momentous question, in which the people both of Spain and of the United States are so deeply interested, all our proceedings ought to be open, frank, and public. They should be of such a character as to challenge the approbation of the world.

We firmly believe that in the progress of human events the time has arrived when the vital interests of Spain are as seriously involved in the sale as those of the United States in the purchase of the island, and that the transaction will prove equally honorable to both nations.

Under these circumstances we can not anticipate a failure unless possibly through the malign influence of foreign powers who possess no right whatever to interfere in the matter.

We proceed to state some of the reasons which have brought us to this conclusion, and, for the sake of clearness, we shall specify them under two distinct heads:

1. The United States ought, if practicable, to purchase Cuba with as little delay as possible.

2. The probability is great that the Government and Cortes of Spain will prove willing to sell it, because this would essentially promote the highest and best interests of the Spanish people.

Then, 1. It must be clear to every reflecting mind that, from the peculiarity of its geographical position, and the considerations attendant on it, Cuba is as necessary to the North American Republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs naturally to that great family of States of which the Union is the providential nursery.

From its locality it commands the mouth of the Mississippi and the immense and annually increasing trade which must seek this avenue to the ocean.

On the numerous navigable streams, measuring an aggregate course of some 30,000 miles, which disembody themselves through this magnificent river into the Gulf of Mexico, the increase of the population within the last ten years amounts to more than that of the entire Union at the time Louisiana was annexed to it.

The natural and main outlet to the products of this entire population, the highway of their direct intercourse with the Atlantic and the Pacific States, can never be secure, but must ever be endangered while Cuba is a dependency of a distant power, in whose possession it has proved to be a source of constant annoyance and embarrassment to their interests.

Indeed, the Union can never enjoy repose nor possess reliable security as long as Cuba is not embraced within its boundaries.

Its immediate acquisition by our Government is of paramount importance, and we can not doubt but that it is a consummation devoutly wished for by its inhabitants.

The intercourse which its proximity to our coasts begets and encourages between them and the citizens of the United States has, in the progress of time, so united their interests and blended their fortunes that they now look upon each other as if they were one people and had but one destiny.

Considerations exist which render delay in the acquisition of this island exceedingly dangerous to the United States.

The system of immigration and labor lately organized within its limits and the tyranny and oppression which characterize its immediate rulers threaten an insurrection at every moment which may result in direful consequences to the American people.

Cuba has thus become to us an unceasing danger and a permanent cause of anxiety and alarm.

But we need not enlarge on these topics. It can scarcely be apprehended that foreign powers, in violation of international law, would interpose their influence with Spain to prevent our acquisition of the island. Its inhabitants are now suffering under the worst of all possible governments—that of absolute despotism—delegated by a distant power to irresponsible agents, who are changed at short intervals, and who are tempted to improve the brief opportunity thus afforded to accumulate fortunes by the basest means.

As long as this system shall endure humanity may in vain demand the suppression of the African slave trade in the island. This is rendered impossible whilst that infamous traffic remains an irresistible temptation and a source of immense profit to needy and avaricious officials, who to attain their ends scruple not to trample the most sacred principles under foot.

The Spanish Government at home may be well disposed, but experience has proved that it can not control these remote depositaries of its power.

Besides, the commercial nations of the world can not fail to perceive and appreciate the great advantages which would result to their people from a dissolution of the forced and unnatural connection between Spain and Cuba and the annexation of the latter to the United States. The trade of England and France with Cuba would in that event assume at once an important and profitable character, and rapidly extend with the increasing population and prosperity of the island.

2. But if the United States and every commercial nation would be benefited by this transfer, the interests of Spain would also be greatly and essentially promoted.

She can not but see what such a sum of money as we are willing to pay for the island would effect in the development of her vast natural resources.

Two-thirds of this sum, if employed in the construction of a system of railroads, would ultimately prove a source of greater wealth to the Spanish people than that opened to their vision by Cortez. Their prosperity would date from the ratification of the treaty of cession.

France has already constructed continuous lines of railways from Havre, Marseille, Valenciennes, and Strasburg, to the Spanish frontier, and anxiously awaits the day when Spain shall find herself in a condition to extend these roads through her northern provinces to Madrid, Seville, Cadiz, Malaga, and the frontiers of Portugal.

This object once accomplished Spain would become a center of attraction for the traveling world, and secure a permanent and profitable market for her various productions. Her fields, under the stimulus given to industry by remunerating prices, would team with cereal grain, and her vineyards would bring forth a vastly increased quantity of choice wines. Spain would speedily become, what a bountiful Providence intended she should be, one of the first nations of continental Europe—rich, powerful, and contented.

Whilst two-thirds of the price of the island would be ample for the completion of her most important public improvements, she might with the remaining forty millions satisfy the demands now pressing so heavily upon her credit and create a sinking fund which would gradually relieve her from the overwhelming debt now paralyzing her energies.

Such is her present wretched financial condition that her best bonds are sold upon her own Bourse at about one-third of their par value; whilst another class, on which she pays no interest, have but a nominal value, and are quoted at about one-sixth of the amount for which they were issued. Besides, these latter are held principally by British creditors who may, from day to day, obtain the effective interposition of their own Government for the purpose of coercing payment. Intimations to that effect have been already thrown out from high quarters, and unless some new source of revenue shall enable Spain to provide for such exigencies it is not improbable that they may be realized. Should Spain reject the present golden opportunity for developing her resources and removing her financial embarrassments, it may never again return.

Cuba, in its palmiest days, never yielded her exchequer after deducting the expenses of her government, after deducting a clear annual income of more than a million and a half of dollars. These expenses have increased to such a degree as to leave a deficit chargeable on the treasury of Spain to the amount of \$800,000.

In a pecuniary point of view, therefore, the island is an incumbrance instead of a source of profit to the mother country.

Under no probable circumstances can Cuba ever yield to Spain 1 per cent on the large amount which the United States are willing to pay for its acquisition. But Spain is in imminent danger of losing Cuba without remuneration.

Extreme oppression, it is now universally admitted, justifies any people in endeavoring to relieve themselves from the yoke of their oppressors. The sufferings which the corrupt, arbitrary, and unrelenting local administration necessarily entails upon the inhabitants of Cuba can not fail to stimulate and keep alive that spirit of resistance and revolution against Spain which has in late years been so often manifested. In this condition of affairs it is vain to expect that the sympathies of the people of the United States will not be warmly enlisted in favor of their oppressed neighbors.

We know that the President is justly inflexible in his determination to execute the neutrality laws; but should the Cubans themselves rise in revolt against the oppression which they suffer, no human power could prevent citizens of the United States and liberal-minded men of other countries from rushing to their assistance. Besides, the present is an age of adventure, in which restless and daring spirits abound in every portion of the world.

It is not improbable, therefore, that Cuba may be wrested from Spain by a successful revolution, and in that event she will lose both the island and the price which we are now willing to pay for it—a price far beyond what was ever paid by one people to another for any province.

It may also be remarked that the settlement of this vexed question by the cession of Cuba to the United States would forever prevent the dangerous complications between nations to which it may otherwise give birth.

It is certain that, should the Cubans themselves organize an insurrection against the Spanish Government and should other independent nations come to the aid of Spain in the contest, no human power could, in our opinion, prevent the people and Government of the United States from taking part in such a civil war in support of their neighbors and friends.

But if Spain, dead to the voice of her own interest, and actuated by stubborn pride and a false sense of honor, should refuse to sell Cuba to the United States, then the question will arise, What ought to be the course of the American Government under such circumstances?

Self-preservation is the first law of nature, with states as well as with individuals. All nations have at different periods acted upon this maxim. Although it has been the pretext for committing flagrant injustice, as in the partition of Poland and other similar cases which history records, yet the principle itself, though often abused, has always been recognized.

The United States has never acquired a foot of territory except by fair purchase, or, as in the case of Texas, upon the free and voluntary application of the people of that independent State, who desired to blend their destinies with our own.

Even our acquisitions from Mexico are no exception to this rule, because, although we might have claimed them by the right of conquest in a just war, yet we purchased them for what was then considered by both parties a full and ample equivalent.

Our past history forbids that we should acquire the island of Cuba without the consent of Spain, unless justified by the great law of self-preservation. We must, in any event, preserve our own conscious rectitude and our own self-respect.

Whilst pursuing this course we can afford to disregard the censures of the world, to which we have been so often and so unjustly exposed.

After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question, Does Cuba in the possession of Spain seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union?

Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then, by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we possess the power; and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home.

Under such circumstances we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter the question whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure. We should, however, be recreant to our duty, be unworthy of our gallant forefathers, and commit base treason against our posterity, should we permit Cuba to be Africanized and become a second Santo Domingo, with all its attendant horrors to the white race, and suffer the flames to extend to our own neighboring shores, seriously to endanger or actually to consume the fair fabric of our Union.

We fear that the course and current of events are rapidly tending toward such a catastrophe. We, however, hope for the best, though we ought certainly to be prepared for the worst.

We also forbear to investigate the present condition of the questions at issue between the United States and Spain. A long series of injuries to our people have been committed in Cuba by Spanish officials and are unredressed. But recently a most flagrant outrage on the rights of American citizens and on the flag of the United States was perpetrated in the harbor of Habana under circumstances which, without immediate redress, would have justified a resort to measures of war in vindication of national honor. That outrage is not only unatoned, but the Spanish Government has deliberately sanctioned the acts of its subordinates and assumed the responsibility attaching to them.

Nothing could more impressively teach us the danger to which those peaceful relations it has ever been the policy of the United States to cherish with foreign nations are constantly exposed than the circumstances of that case. Situated as Spain and the United States are, the latter have forborne to resort to extreme measures.

But this course can not, with due regard to their own dignity as an independent nation, continue; and our recommendations, now submitted, are dictated by the firm belief that the cession of Cuba to the United States, with stipulations as beneficial to Spain as those suggested, is the only effective mode of settling all past differences and of securing the two countries against future collisions.

We have already witnessed the happy results for both countries which followed a similar arrangement in regard to Florida.

Yours, very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.
J. Y. MASON.
PIERRE SOULÉ.

Hon. WM. L. MARCY, Secretary of State.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate for any length of time, but the remarkable speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] I think calls for a very short reply.

The Senator started out this afternoon with the declaration, as I understood him, and if I misstate him he will correct me, that but for politics there would be no criticism of this act.

Mr. President, that is within the proprieties of debate; I know there are precedents for that kind of language, but it goes further than anything that has been said heretofore during this debate. I am not one to contend that a Senator may not express himself as he feels, provided, of course, that he keeps within reasonable limits.

The Senator's attitude is that if an act has been done that can not be undone then you are bound to keep your mouth shut, and that any criticism of that act, because you can not undo the evil, is uncalled for and not justified.

Mr. President, that is not the law which governs this body.

That is not the law which governs honest discussion amongst men anywhere. It may be, and undoubtedly from a practical standpoint it is, that we can not undo what the President has done, but does it follow that we can not complain? Does it follow that we may not enter a protest in becoming language and in becoming spirit against what we think is a violation of international law, and setting a precedent that some of us, at least, believe will rise up to trouble us in the immediate and distant future alike?

Mr. President, in my judgment there has never been anything done in the diplomatic affairs of this nation so dangerous and so threatening as that. The Senator asks if Senators do not understand that if there was an offense in the President when he recognized Panama, twenty other great nations of the world have committed the same offense? It is not my province to complain particularly here of the great nations of the world.

But, Mr. President, as I said the other day, every evil precedent, every violation of international law, every violation of constitutional law, will be followed by a greater violation of the law and the Constitution, and the first violation will be quoted as a precedent. You have got it now, for twenty nations have followed our act.

When it comes to a question of propriety or of law, there is some distinction between the action of Great Britain and France and the action of this Government, not only because of our particular relations with Colombia, but from the fact that it has been the universal practice among the nations of the earth when some great, leading nation has recognized another nation that other nations should follow. That was the case when the South American people were left to contest with Spain for more than ten years. When we recognized them, then other nations, who had refused up to that time to do so, followed our example.

The Senator from Connecticut complains that there have been criticisms of the President, and, he says, some brutal criticisms of the President, and sometimes thinly veiled criticisms of the President. I have criticised the President. I can not contend with my associates in this Chamber that an act is unlawful without a criticism of the President; but I certainly have never been guilty of any infraction of the decencies of debate in that contention, unless when the President has done an illegal act it is contended that I am to sit here for fear of Presidential disfavor or the disfavor of my associates in this Chamber if I should differ with the President. I have not myself reached the point where I believe the King can do no wrong. I have not reached the point here, and I thank God I never did reach it in my political life, when I would refrain from expressing my judgment upon an act of the Executive because he happened to be the President I helped to elect.

Mr. President, if I should retort, as I might justly retort to the Senator from Connecticut, it certainly would not be more offensive than he has been if I should say if the President did not bring his political influence to bear upon this Senate this treaty would never be heard of. I have not said that, Mr. President.

The Senator from Connecticut asks what are Senators going to do about it? Why, Mr. President, that is none of his business. What right has he to ask me what I am going to do about it? But I have never been afraid, in public life, to take the consequences of my acts or the logical conclusions of my declarations. I stated here the other day on the floor of the Senate what I was going to do. I am going to vote against this treaty. I am not going to vote against it because I am opposed to a ship canal, although I am, and everybody here has known for twenty years that I was. I am not going to vote against it because I think Nicaragua would be a better route; but I am going to vote against it because it was inaugurated by a body that is not entitled by the universal recognition of mankind heretofore to be intrusted with the power to make a treaty with us concerning that land. It may make it, Mr. President, in the cold letter of the law; it may be, since twenty nations have recognized that nation, that it will be recognized in the future by the world as a government, and that our Government, having treated with it, it will become a fixed fact that we shall build a canal under that treaty.

Mr. President, when that treaty shall be ratified, as the Senator from Connecticut tells us it will be—and I have no doubt it will—when that treaty shall be ratified strictly and legally it will become a law of this country. We are not allowed, in the nature of things, to go back and to find out whether the first step in such an act was an illegal one or a legal one. When this Senate puts the imprint of its approval upon it it becomes the law of the land, and I shall do what every other citizen has to do—recognize it as the law of the land. What did the Senator suppose we were going to do?

I heard the other day a Senator, who is not within my eye at this moment, say that there had been incendiary remarks in this body touching this thing. Mr. President, I do not know what that means. I certainly have never heard that word applied before to members of this Senate. It certainly was not intended as

a complimentary statement. It was accusatory; and it was accusatory because we dared to stand here on this floor and say we differed from the party in power; because we dared here to assert the right of freemen; and the Senator asks, "What are you going to do about it?" and says the President had the right under the law to do it.

The President does have the right to recognize a nation. What-ever may have been the doubts regarding that right originally, precedent and practice have given him that authority, and I have myself never disputed it. He could recognize a nation, but I repeat the law of the world requires him to wait until certain conditions exist, and then to proceed or not to proceed as he sees fit. If the President violates that law and proceeds to recognition, I admit that we are helpless. That is one of the misfortunes and one of the vices of unconstitutional acts and violations of the laws of the world. It is not any answer and it is not any defense to say, "You are helpless; you are bound; what we propose to do we can do, and what we propose to do we will do."

I will admit that the President could do it, and I have no question but that his act must be final, because the courts have said again and again that the recognition of a government is a question not for the judicial department but for the political department of a government—a rightful decision, Mr. President, one of which I can not and of which no other man ought to complain.

But is the man who questions the virtue or the vices of an act to be answered by the statement, "Why, I have got the power?" I remember the old Latin maxim, which I should not dare now to quote from memory, but I do remember the translation which has been given to the world—"Resolve not what you may do, but resolve what becometh you to do." It is not any answer to complain of the violation of a law even that it is left to the Executive to determine a state of facts. He must determine that state of facts carefully, honestly, justly, and righteously, or else he is open to criticism.

Mr. President, I have not heard any brutal attacks upon the President; I have not heard anything worse in criticism of him than I have repeatedly heard in this Chamber in relation to other Executives. I remember—and I can refer to the debates which took place in this Chamber—when men who were connected with the political party then in power said on this floor things infinitely worse about the then Executive than anybody has thought of saying here now. I recall that I sat in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on the day that the impeachment resolutions of Andrew Johnson passed through that body. It was an impeachment by men who were members of the political organization which had elected Mr. Johnson Vice-President, and thus made him President of the United States. I do not mean to say now, after so long a lapse of time, that I either agree or disagree with what was then done, but I know that then the right to criticise the Executive on this floor was not denied by the party then in power, which is the party that is now in power here.

I recall when that great soldier, General Grant, was President of the United States that on this floor not only men of the opposite party, but men of his own party, arraigned him before the bar of public opinion as not doing his duty as they saw it. No less a man than the greatest man, in my judgment, who ever sat in this Chamber from Massachusetts—Charles Sumner—stood here and complained of infractions of the law by the then President, whom he had helped to elect.

Mr. President, I shall ever maintain here while I stay here the right to criticise any man in public life, and I deny the right of any Senator to tell me, because I am helpless to cure a particular evil of which I may complain, that I must keep my seat.

The Senator from Connecticut has gone into details to defend the President's action in Panama; and amongst other things he has told us that General Torres threatened to kill all the American citizens there. The only authority for that statement is the authority of the prefect of that town, who went to Commander Hubbard and told him that such a threat had been made. Our consul there in his correspondence never made such a suggestion, and the same afternoon General Torres came to Commander Hubbard, who says he was in a very good frame of mind and very friendly, and made some suggestions to which Hubbard did not feel inclined to agree. I say there is no really good ground for making the statement that General Torres proposed at any time to commence an onslaught upon the citizens of the United States then temporarily on the Isthmus. I know very well what the Senator referred to, but if the statement had been true I think our consul would have heard of it. Such suggestions are made for the purpose of raising a prejudice to get rid of this controversy.

The Senator from Connecticut is an old and tried debater. He is full of the methods of forensic debaters. He takes his opponents, puts them on the stand, charges them with saying what no one of them has ever suggested, and then he appeals, "Is there anybody here who will say that it is right or that it is wrong?" The Senator asks, "Will anybody say that he did not have the right

to send our ships there?" Why, Mr. President, no man made any such statement on this floor. When the question was asked me by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], I answered frankly that the President had the right to send the ships there. I never complained of his sending them there. What I have complained of was the impression which went out there from the utterances of the President—I mean official utterances—saying to the commanders of the ships there practically that there should be no interference with the revolution, if a revolution should be attempted.

Mr. President, I am not so ignorant of international law that I do not know that we have a right to send our ships down to the Isthmus and to put our marines on the shore there, treaty or no treaty, if American interests demand their protection. I do not know where the authority comes from, but I know the practice is a universal one, which every nation in the world is now following, except in a few instances. It never has been done with any of the great nations of the world. I do not suppose anybody would attempt it with Great Britain. I suppose if there should be an emeute, an insurrection, in London, that nobody would think of landing marines there.

Mr. President, this doctrine has grown up in modern times, first, that such interference was proper in dealing with certain classes of nations, those who were not able to protect themselves, and who were likely to commit violence on foreigners in their ports. We have extended this doctrine now practically to the world. Has anybody here denied that right?

Then the Senator says we had another illustration of what the President may do—that he may send soldiers to China. Mr. President, there is not any authority of law anywhere for the President to send troops to China—I mean direct authority of law. It is one of those things which I think are included in the President's oath to take care of the great interests of the American people. Mr. Buchanan, whose authority the Senator from Connecticut presented here, declared that there was no authority to land troops on the Isthmus either by treaty or otherwise, and yet he declared, before he concluded, that if necessity required it would be done without reference to the law.

No man can find a letter or a word anywhere which will justify the sending of troops to China. Mr. President, if I had been President of the United States, I would have done exactly what the Executive did. I would have sent the troops there and have taken the chances of criticism, perhaps. After all, it was the proper thing to do, and I have never heard a word of criticism against that act anywhere, certainly not in this Chamber in this debate.

Why does the Senator drag that in? He drags it in because he is not satisfied with his own case and wants to make a different case and attack that. It is the custom of debaters to do that. I remember that away back in the classic days Cicero was complained of in that respect, and perhaps every other great orator has been. But, after all, it is not quite a fair way to debate a great question involving so much as this does.

I despair by anything that I could say in this debate of influencing anybody. But there is one thing which the Senator from Connecticut said to which I want to call attention, and then I shall suspend. He said that we complained that a great wrong had been done. He denied that. I expected he would. He then said:

What is to be done? What will Senators do then? The Senator from Colorado is very frank about it. He would withdraw the ships of the United States which now patrol the waters of the Isthmus of Panama. Would any other Senator do it?

Mr. President, if I thought we could accomplish it, I would be in favor of doing that thing, but I would not withdraw the ships from Panama until we had at least made some arrangement by which there should be no fighting on the Isthmus. I believe that we are responsible to-day for that Government down there. I do not say that the President has taken any hand in it, but I do believe the influence of the Americans connected with that transaction has brought about that condition.

As I said the other day, Mr. Amador—and he was one of the originators of the revolution—declared publicly in the United States that but for the fact that the people of Panama knew the Government of the United States would assist them they would not have entered into the revolution; and when the other day they had their so-called convention, in which they started out to get a constitution, one of the prime movers said in the convention: "We are secure; we have back of us the great people of the United States."

Mr. President, I would not leave the people of Panama to the tender mercies of Colombia; but I would say to them and say to Colombia: "We restore the condition that existed on the 2d day of November, and we will bid you keep your hands off Panama. Then we will enter into some kind of an arrangement by which we will determine what our rights shall be and what yours are."

I am not complaining of the great amount of money that an isthmian canal is going to cost. As I said the other day, if the people want it they are able to build it, and if they throw the money into the sea it is their business; but I think a great enter-

prise that will command, if it is successful, the admiration of mankind and be a work that nothing in the history of the world has equaled might be carried on by this Government in such a way that, when we complete it, we should have no feeling that we had transcended the proprieties or the decencies of the relation that ought to exist between Colombia and us. If this Administration had come here with a request for a great appropriation for the purpose of composing that difficulty, I am one that would vote for it.

The Senator says that this is an attempt not to have the canal on the Panama route. The President said if we did not get a canal on the Panama route, then we should get none at all. That declaration is equivalent to saying that the opposition here is because we do not want any canal. Mr. President, if my vote would defeat the canal, I should give it without the slightest hesitation.

Mr. SPOONER. Any canal?

Mr. TELLER. I mean any canal, unless it be a tide-water canal. I should have to think, I should have to look into that; but we have no promise yet of that kind of a canal. If the question was between a lock canal and a tide-water canal, I should vote for a tide-water canal.

I am receiving from the people of Colorado petitions, not to be presented to the Senate, asking me not to oppose the canal; but I believe that the public sentiment of the people of the United States is in favor of the canal. I shall vote against the treaty. As I said the other day, I shall not attempt in the slightest degree to postpone, hinder, or delay this work; but I hope in some way I may be allowed to satisfy my associates in this Chamber that I am expressing to them frankly my opinion on this question, and not hiding behind something and concealing something, professing one thing and doing another. I do not like to have the Senator from Connecticut or anybody else say that I, as a Senator on this floor, would have been silent if it had not been that I sit on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, the temptation is great to say some other things before I sit down, but I shall resist it. I have discharged the duty that is incumbent upon me here as a Senator. I have expressed my opposition to this measure; I have expressed my fear of the result, and I have done, I believe, what becometh me to do in this matter. Having so done, I leave it to the party in power—not, however, Mr. President, because they have any greater responsibility in the matter than I have.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. Does the Senator want to take the floor for the purpose of making a speech?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I desire to make a few remarks.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator would just as lief go on to-morrow morning, I think there ought to be an executive session, and I will make such a motion, by his leave.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator withhold his motion for one minute?

Mr. CULLOM. I withdraw the motion temporarily.

RECESS APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. TILLMAN. I want to give notice that immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning I shall ask permission to address the Senate very briefly in regard to a resolution as to what constitutes a recess, which I introduced here long before the holidays, and which I have been trying to get an opportunity to have acted upon. I shall endeavor to call it up just as soon as we get through with the morning business and try to get rid of it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I now renew my motion for an executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twelve minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 22, 1904, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1904.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

William P. Upshur, of Virginia.
Lovick P. Pinkston, of Texas.
Arthur P. Crist, of District of Columbia.
Edward W. Banker, of New York.
William E. Parker, of Rhode Island.
William M. Small, of Maryland.
Epaminondas L. Bigler, of Ohio.
Robert B. Farquharson, of Vermont.

Charles R. Sanderson, of District of Columbia.
Walter N. Hill, of Massachusetts.
Tillman Bunch, of South Carolina.
Benjamin S. Berry, of Pennsylvania.
Russell B. Putnam, of New York.
Benjamin A. Lewis, of New York.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ben D. McGee, of Ohio.
William L. F. Simonpietri, of New York.
Neal B. Farwell, of Minnesota.
Reginald Spear, of Pennsylvania.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

George W. Dietz to be postmaster at Congress, in the county of Yavapai and Territory of Arizona. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

CONNECTICUT.

Augustus G. Ising to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in place of Augustus G. Ising. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1904.

ILLINOIS.

August J. Beger to be postmaster at Nauvoo, in the county of Hancock and State of Illinois, in place of August J. Beger. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1904.

Anna A. Buntin to be postmaster at Bushnell, in the county of McDonough and State of Illinois, in place of Henry S. Buntin, deceased.

Eugene L'Hote to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Iroquois and State of Illinois, in place of Eugene L'Hote. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1904.

INDIANA.

Charles E. Disbro to be postmaster at Greentown, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana, in place of Amos A. Covalt. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1903.

KANSAS.

Henry S. Mueller to be postmaster at Sedgwick, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas, in place of Henry S. Mueller. Incumbent's commission expired January 17, 1904.

MAINE.

Clark H. Barker to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Cumberland and State of Maine, in place of Clark H. Barker. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1904.

Arthur A. Dinsmore to be postmaster at Dover, in the county of Piscataquis and State of Maine, in place of Arthur A. Dinsmore. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1904.

MASSACHUSETTS.

William H. Coffey to be postmaster at Tufts College, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in place of William H. Coffey. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1904.

MICHIGAN.

Fred Slocum to be postmaster at Caro, in the county of Tuscola and State of Michigan, in place of Fred Slocum. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1904.

MISSOURI.

James M. Freeman to be postmaster at Shelbyville, in the county of Shelby and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

Isaac V. McPherson to be postmaster at Aurora, in the county of Lawrence and State of Missouri, in place of McCord L. Coleman, resigned.

William E. Osterwald to be postmaster at Festus, in the county of Jefferson and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential April 1, 1903.

Clarence M. Zeigle to be postmaster at Bunceton, in the county of Cooper and State of Missouri. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

NEBRASKA.

John H. Crowder to be postmaster at Gordon, in the county of Sheridan and State of Nebraska, in place of John H. Crowder. Incumbent's commission expires February 5, 1904.

Henry E. Palmer to be postmaster at Omaha, in the county of Douglas and State of Nebraska, in place of Joseph Crow. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1903.

NEW JERSEY.

R. Frank Treweeke to be postmaster at Butler, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

NEW YORK.

Dudley S. Mersereau to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Broome and State of New York, in place of Dudley S. Mersereau. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1904.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Franklin A. Barkley to be postmaster at Lincolnton, in the county of Lincoln and State of North Carolina, in place of Franklin A. Barkley. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1903.

William J. McDaniel to be postmaster at Rutherfordton, in the county of Rutherford and State of North Carolina. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Henry Engelter to be postmaster at New Salem, in the county of Morton and State of North Dakota. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Samuel G. Wilson to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Samuel G. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1904.

RHODE ISLAND.

Eugene R. Phillips to be postmaster at Phillipsdale, in the county of Providence and State of Rhode Island, in place of Eugene R. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1904.

TENNESSEE.

Leander W. Dutro to be postmaster at Memphis, in the county of Shelby and State of Tennessee, in place of Leander W. Dutro. Incumbent's commission expires February 5, 1904.

Edmund D. Hughes to be postmaster at Mountpleasant, in the county of Maury and State of Tennessee, in place of Edmund D. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1904.

TEXAS.

William H. Bradley to be postmaster at Groveton, in the county of Trinity and State of Texas. Office became Presidential April 1, 1903.

VERMONT.

Mary W. Chase to be postmaster at Derby Line, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in place of Mary W. Chase. Incumbent's commission expires February 2, 1904.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 21, 1904.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF MINNESOTA.

Eli S. Warner, of Minnesota, to be surveyor-general of Minnesota, his term having expired January 17, 1904.

PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Second Lieut. William E. W. Hall to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

William H. Jordan, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for the district of Gloucester, in the State of Massachusetts.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Edward W. Hilker to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

Frederick H. Richardson to be postmaster at Tampico, in the county of Whiteside and State of Illinois.

Benjamin F. Shaw to be postmaster at Dixon, in the county of Lee and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Frank M. Pickerl to be postmaster at Argos, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana.

MICHIGAN.

Edgar B. Gregory to be postmaster at Jonesville, in the county of Hillsdale and State of Michigan.

John P. Scott, jr., to be postmaster at Delray, in the county of Wayne and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

Edward Chard to be postmaster at Belleplaine, in the county of Scott and State of Minnesota.

William R. Edwards to be postmaster at Tracy, in the county of Lyons and State of Minnesota.

Warren D. Harden to be postmaster at Le Roy, in the county of Mower and State of Minnesota.

WISCONSIN.

Horace J. Blanchard to be postmaster at Colby, in the county of Marathon and State of Wisconsin.

Albert L. Fontaine to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, in the county of Wood and State of Wisconsin.

Ashley S. Higgins to be postmaster at Markesan, in the county of Green Lake and State of Wisconsin.

Joseph E. Parry to be postmaster at Florence, in the county of Florence and State of Wisconsin.

Theodore Riel to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin.

Charles W. Tyler to be postmaster at Mellen, in the county of Ashland and State of Wisconsin.

Lansing A. Wilcox to be postmaster at Cadott, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin.

Buck Williams to be postmaster at Iola, in the county of Wau-paca and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 21, 1904.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 19, 1904, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

Mr. BROWN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Mines and Mining be allowed to print the proceedings already had on the mining-school bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Mines and Mining be granted leave to print the hearings already had upon the mining-school bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HORSES AND CARRIAGES AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Labor, to whom was referred House resolution No. 145, report the same back by substitute, and recommend the passage of the substitute.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to this House, at his earliest convenience, a statement showing the number of horses, carriages, and automobiles maintained at Government expense for the use of officials in his Department, together with a statement showing the cost of said horses, carriages, automobiles, and harness, and the amount of wages paid to men acting as coachmen, footmen, and chauffeurs, whether carried on the rolls as such or in some other classification; also, the list of officials entitled to the use of said carriages.

The following amendments were recommended by the committee:

In line 7, after the word "harness," insert the words "the date of purchase from what fund the payment was made;" also, after the word "carriages," in line 10, insert "and the date when such service was inaugurated."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments recommended by the committee.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10670) making appropriations for the support of the Army, and for other purposes. And pending that I desire to state that the Committee on Military Affairs this morning agreed to not exceeding two hours and one-half debate on each side; the chairman of the committee to control one half, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] to control the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, asks unanimous consent that there may be not exceeding two hours and one-half debate on each side, and that the chairman of the committee shall control one half and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] control the other half for the minority. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion of Mr. HULL was then agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 10670, the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee sets out in full detail all new legislation proposed in the bill. If the Members will examine the report, they will see that it sets out very fully all new legislation proposed to be enacted in the bill. The only new legislation of any importance refers to the consolidation of what is left of the Adjutant-General's Bureau with the Record and Pension Bureau, to constitute a new bureau of the War Department, to be known as the "Military Secretary's Bureau." The reasons for that legislation are set out very fully in the report of the Secretary of War in transmitting the bill to Congress, which is printed as a part of the report of the committee. I think any one reading the bill will readily see that it is in the interest of good administration to consolidate these two bureaus. The Secretary of War, soon to retire, has probably been more persistent and efficient in urging and securing the passage of legislation improving the Army than any Secretary the Government has ever had.

While as chairman of the committee I have some doubts as to all of the legislation we have enacted standing the test of experi-

ence, I have no doubt but the result, the legislation he has advocated as an entirety, will be good for the country and the Army. Nothing but time and experience can demonstrate the wisdom of some of the legislation recently enacted. In his estimate this year he has so cut down the estimates of the different bureaus as to make the saving by Congress of a smaller amount than ordinarily comes to us, and we have only been able to lop off or prune down the estimates some \$3,000,000.

We have taken one new feature in the bill. You all remember when the militia act was passed section 15 provided that appropriations for the militia should be made in the army appropriation bill. The maneuvers that were had the past year were paid for from the army appropriations, so that the country at large and the Congress of the United States could not determine what was expended for militia and what was expended for the regular establishment. The committee this year have segregated the items and allowed for the militia the amount that the Department estimated would be necessary, and provided that all expenses for the militia in participating in the maneuvers in the different parts of the country should be paid from this appropriation for the militia, and that the War Department must report in detail to Congress at the next session the amount of money it used for such purpose. That was done so that the people and the Congress of the United States might always know what had been used for the different arms of the service, for the regular establishment, and what is called the "militia" or "National Guard" establishment of the country.

We have done one other thing. We have so changed the law in regard to the disbursements of the Government for the Army that they must not lap over one upon another to the extent that they have heretofore, and must be reported in detail, so that if there is a shortage in appropriation they must come to Congress and ask for the additional money, in place of using one appropriation to carry on another and different expenditure of the Government. I think, though, these are the only material changes in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I only interrupt the gentleman at this time to avail myself of his superior information with reference to the army appropriation bill and the administration it supports. I desire to ask him if he can give me about the figures of the amounts expended in scientific research, investigation, and operation of the subject of aerial navigation last year?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to say to the gentleman from Indiana that the Committee on Appropriations can undoubtedly give that information, as no part of the army appropriation was used for that purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then, I am informed by the gentleman that no part of the appropriations carried on the army bill last year was made use of for the purpose I suggest.

Mr. HULL. That is my understanding. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], a member of the committee, and will make my explanations of the bill in detail when we consider the various appropriations under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, the retirement in a few days of such a Secretary of War as we now have marks an epoch in the organization and efficiency of the Army of the United States. It may well be said that since the outbreak of the Spanish war that Army has been reorganized. That reorganization has been accomplished chiefly through the efforts of the gentleman who now bears the respect and admiration of everyone everywhere; our Secretary of War, Elihu Root—great as a lawyer, great as a statesman, great as a diplomat, as shown in the last treaty with respect to Alaska, great in detail, great in principle, perhaps greatest in a rapier-like quickness of comprehension and of wit which carries his thought to the heart and soul of everyone he speaks to, great in his energy and earnestness—a man whom we all lament when he has to leave the Army that he has served so well. When he took his place he announced to the country that he had taken a retainer from the Army and would stand by that client, and nobly has he done so.

Credit for the changes of this reorganization is also due to others. We of this House can not forget the painstaking service of the committee of which I have the honor to be a member, the ability of its chairman, the peace that has prevailed within it, and the one mind that has always existed there between members of both parties, so that politics in the management of the Army has never gained even an entering wedge. We can not forget the services of the Senate and of its committee. We can not forget that these great reforms were first instituted under that President who was a man of peace and hated war, but who, when war broke out, was

the greatest Commander in Chief that this country has perhaps ever known, carrying on that war in two hemispheres, making it in a sickly season, and ending it all within a few days. We can not forget the earnest interest that our present President now takes in all matters affecting the Army. But to whomsoever the credit is due, this bill, taken line by line, represents the growth of a reorganization which, in my judgment, has kept almost all that was good in the past and which has brought in so many new things that are good that to read the bill is only to enumerate them.

Mr. Chairman, when the Spanish war broke out we had an army limited to a certain small number of men to each company. We readopted the plan that had been used at the time of the Mexican war, but forgotten, of allowing the number of each company to vary according to the needs of the country, so that the Army may be a body of one number in time of peace and double that number in time of war or in anticipation of war. By this plan new recruits go alongside of the old men who have experience. Thus we do not send an untried army of untried men and untried officers into the field, but an army in which the new men work alongside of veterans, under officers who understand their business. In that one thing we revolutionized the Army.

The war developed the faults of our staff system, and the first appropriation here is for contingencies of the Army, including the office of the General Staff. We found a President, as Commander in Chief, and a Secretary of War, a civilian, with an office, but that the bureaus of the Department were so separated that it was almost impossible to bring their work together so as to be sure that the Quartermaster-General knew where supplies were going to be needed according to the orders which sent forth troops or that the Commissary-General should know what could be carried by the Quartermaster-General.

All this work had to be done by and pass through one man. The great work that we have done as to the Army, the greatest improvement of all and the most recent, is indicated in the first items of the bill, in which provision is made for the Army War College, for the General Staff, and for the officers of the various departments who are detailed from the line of the Army. This change was made only last year by an act that altered the whole organization of those departments. They were once composed entirely of officers who had nothing more to do with the Army after they had once been put in their offices and become bound by the system of red tape which always must be found in offices. We now take line officers from the field and detail them so that they learn the business of the office, while at the same time they know the needs of the line and will do their best to supply them, even if they have to take responsibility.

And over all the departments we have placed the organization of the General Staff—officers detailed from the highest rank down to that of major and captain—to inform themselves about the needs of the country in time of war and to coordinate all the departments as if they were one. I find this stated best in the bill that established that staff:

The duties of the General Staff Corps shall be to prepare plans for the national defense and for the mobilization of the military forces in time of war; to investigate and report upon all questions affecting the efficiency of the Army and its state of preparation for military operations; to render professional aid and assistance to the Secretary of War and to general officers and other superior commanders, and to act as their agents in informing and coordinating the action of all the different officers who are subject under the terms of this act to the supervision of the Chief of Staff; and to perform such other military duties not otherwise assigned by law as may be from time to time prescribed by the President.

Under this General Staff or as part of its work we provide for the needs of an army war college, a school of submarine defense, United States service schools, an artillery school, a general service and staff college, and a school of application for cavalry and infantry. Education of the officers in the line of their duty is going on all the while, and it is by these new institutions that it is effected.

The next item of the bill (for the items of this bill, line by line, show the work that has been done) is for pay of officers of the line. And the first officer is a Lieutenant-General. It is only a few years since the Congress of the United States passed an act to reward suitably the great veteran of the civil war who then was the Major-General Commanding the Army, by giving him the rank that belonged to his position, of Lieutenant-General of the Armies of the United States. When the General Staff came in there were fit men to be his successors. There was General Young, also a veteran of the civil war, who had entered the service as a private. The office has now found General Chaffee, with a like distinguished record in both the civil and Spanish wars.

But the reorganization did more than merely create the position of Lieutenant-General. That office was old and had been held by various distinguished men for many years after the civil war. It had been abolished because it was found by experience that somehow or other the friction between the President as Commander in Chief and the Lieutenant-General as in command of the Army—the interference of functions which seemed to exist

between those two officers wherever their opinions differed—was such as to hurt rather than help the Army. But in the last reorganization and in creating this position a wise plan has been adopted, avoiding all such difficulty, because under the present law the Chief of Staff, the Lieutenant-General and highest military officer, is not the general commanding the Army. That command belongs only to the President. When war arises, no other man can take the place of the Commander in Chief under the Constitution.

A military officer, purely military, can advise how best to meet any military problem; but he can not determine whether action is made necessary by other considerations. He can not determine whether there be danger of foreign complications, making immediate action necessary, which would be foolish except for that danger. A purely military officer can not determine whether the Treasury of the United States can afford to wait or whether it is safe to wait and run the risk of discussion and dispute among the people, which would hurt us elsewhere. He can not know how much the prestige of early success may be needed. He can not know what the naval exigencies are. There are various other matters which he can not know.

The responsibility for action in time of war must be placed beyond all question upon the one Commander in Chief. And we have so placed it. The Lieutenant-General, as Chief of Staff, now holds his office, not, as before, for life, but for a fixed term of years; and he may be replaced by another man at any time as Chief of Staff. He is not in command. He holds an entirely different position. He becomes the aid, the helper, the confidant, the chosen confidant, of the President. He brings him in touch with the Army, instead of holding an independent position. He takes most of the functions that formerly belonged practically to the Adjutant-General. He becomes the military secretary, advising the President and executing whatever the President may desire to accomplish, and as such he falls into his appropriate place. And this reform is part of the work that has been done and completed in the last year.

I have already referred to the pay of the enlisted men of all grades, and that we are able in time of peace to reduce our expenses, because we reduce our Army to a minimum. Last year we did more. The Army is nothing unless it be an army of marksmen. In the Navy the general power of the President to fix the pay is called into operation (for in the Navy pay is fixed by regulation and not by an act of Congress), and in the Navy they have long paid first-class gunners one sum and second-class gunners another. In the Army we last year for the first time allowed extra pay—small, it is true—of \$1 a month to every expert with the rifle. And we have an amendment in this bill—subject to a point of order, as all these improvements have been, but a point which in my judgment no man in this House will raise—we have an amendment under this article of pay to give first-class gunners of field artillery \$2 a month and second-class gunners \$1 a month in addition to their regular pay.

Then comes the pay of the officers in the departments. Only an inspection of the list can show the marvelous change that has taken place in the officers of those departments. Formerly they were put into the department for life, sometimes being appointed from civil life, sometimes from the Army. Now, even at the end of one year of the workings of the new plan, more than half of the officers of those departments are detailed from the line for the period of four years to learn the general business of the departments and the general management of an army that can only be learned there or in assigned duty, and they go back at the end of that time to their regiments, carrying with them their experience and sending in their place practical men to carry out the same work and study the same problems.

Mr. Chairman, the next item upon this list is the pay of retired officers. It is not a small item, but it is not a very large one. It is \$2,369,900.95 out of a total appropriation of some \$75,000,000. I know there is a jealousy prevailing in the House and among the people at large with reference to the pay of retired officers. Mr. Chairman, there is no money so well spent as that which keeps good men in the Army, because they know that they will be cared for in their old age after they have served for salaries much less than those that the same skill and ability could command in private life. There is no money better spent than that which secures that result, and more especially as it enables you to do in an army what you could not do otherwise, namely, to get an officer off the active list and upon the retired list after he has done his work the moment that he gets to an age or to a state of health in which he will not do his work efficiently.

We do not suffer in the Army as you always do suffer in a department where there is no pension list. We are able to keep the officers young and active by taking care of those who have grown old in the service and promoting along the line. No army can be efficient and active, no officers will be ambitious who have not the chance of promotion when they do their duty. It is fair to

say to the House, however, that we stand in a peculiar position at the present time. In one day the retirement of fifteen officers was announced, only three days ago. Of the 112 brigadier and major generals on the retired list, there were some 40 who were retired last year within one year, and the reason for this comes from a state of affairs that is unique in the history of any army. Eight years ago every brigadier-general, every colonel, and almost every major, as well as a large majority of the captains, at least in the artillery, and some lieutenants of artillery, were actual veterans of a civil war which had ended thirty years before that time. Those officers did not want to retire, because they would get less pay upon retirement than in active service.

Our Army had been reduced in 1870 by striking off very many worthy officers from the list, until it was practically composed of the elite of the veterans of that civil war, who at the same time, by reason of that reduction, had no opportunity of proper promotion. An army of 25,000 men, such as we had in 1880 and up to a few years before the Spanish war, could only afford room for eight or nine brigades and eight brigadier-generals of the line and some two or three major-generals. An army such as we have now affords room for certainly double that number, besides the fact that we have given more rank to officers of the staff corps, and by reason of that fact these old veterans of the civil war, who had done their work in the Army for so many years, were getting less promotion than in any army in the world.

It was with the view of somehow equalizing their lot that President McKinley instituted the policy of allowing men to retire as brigadier-generals perhaps a little before the age at which they could be forced into retirement, in order to make room for new men to be promoted. The fifteen men who were retired the other day, the forty who were retired last year, and the others who have been retired since 1896 were all but one or two veterans of the civil war; and the retirements made with this increased grade were made in pursuance of a policy urged upon Congress by the President and his Secretary of War. President McKinley and President Roosevelt have both urged upon this Congress that they would only be doing justice if they allow to every veteran of the civil war who has served his country so many years at that time the opportunity to go upon the retired list with one increase of grade.

Partially this has been done since 1897 by promotion with immediate retirement, by which President McKinley and President Roosevelt practically have secured retirement with increased grade. After a while this process must stop, or rather it should stop when the last of the veterans of the civil war is to be retired. It has been my judgment that this promotion on retirement for civil-war veterans should be made a matter of law; that it ought to be made equal to all; that all officers who have by any chance missed that promotion—as it is obvious that they might, those veterans of the civil war—that all veterans of the civil war, either on the retired list or to be put upon the retired list, should have an increase of one grade, with the proviso that this is not to apply to officers who were promoted simply for the purpose of retirement, or within such a short period of, say, a few months, of the time for their retirement as shows that promotion was made with reference to retirement. The House has not thus far been willing to pass such an amendment, although it becomes more and more necessary in simple justice every year.

When we look at the retired list and see the men who were wounded during the civil war and have remained ever since as lieutenants upon that list, or when we look at those who a few years ago before this policy was instituted went out at a lower rank than they would if they could have stayed a little longer, and when we look at the fact that you can not always arrange this little matter of the appointment of a few brigadier-generals so as to do this, that you must sometimes go by the very man who was intended to be affected by it, it seems certain that this ought to be made a matter of law. It has been urged repeatedly by Secretary Root. It would cost less than half a million a year added to this two and a half millions of which I have spoken. It would enable the Army to have its promotions active and legal, and allow it to be done without any seeming evasion of the statutes of the United States. I call it a seeming evasion, for the promotion of a man to an office that you do not seem to intend him to hold seems more or less to be an evasion of the law.

On the other hand, a promotion for the purpose of retirement is a reward of long and faithful services to which a man is entitled, which he would get if he stayed in the Army until he was absolutely forced to retire, and it facilitates the promotion of younger men to the higher positions and keeps the Army alive. I stand by the action of the President in this regard. But I say that the time has come when that retirement with increased pay should apply to every civil war veteran, accompanied by the proviso, perhaps, that no officer should be retired at his own request until he has served one year in the grade to which he was appointed.

Mr. Chairman, we find next in this bill provisions for the pay of nurses, hospital matrons, and the superintendent of the nurse corps. Congress and the Government should be proud of the change in the organization of our Hospital Corps, which has put the nursing of our soldiers and their care in time of sickness in the kind and sympathetic hands of woman instead of intrusting it to the class of men that are often detailed as hospital stewards. There is likewise in this bill an appropriation for a school for hospital stewards. You find in it appropriation for dental surgeons under contract, to see that the men's teeth are taken care of and that they are saved the terrors of toothache. That provision was new within a few years.

In this bill we find a provision for a Porto Rican battalion and for Philippine scouts. We have thus enlarged the functions of the Army so that instead of running the risk of their tyrannizing over various alien races we employ their own people to keep order.

We next come to the great appropriations for subsistence, horses, barracks, quarters, and transportation. Our Quartermaster-General's Department, called upon suddenly for transportation to the distant island possessions, has organized a transport service which is the marvel of the world for efficiency and economy, and which saves this Government, according to the report, millions of dollars every year in comparison with the price that would be paid for private transportation. The work done is beyond all admiration. The honesty, the efficiency, the intelligence of the various bureaus of our War Department, whether in transportation, in the commissary, in the foods furnished our troops, in the comfort that is given them, in the management of the Surgeon-General's Office—these are not matters of legislation; but we have trusted our Army so far as to create, or rather to recreate—we had departments, but in a small way—to recreate the vast machinery that we had during the civil war, using all the experience that we had gained during that war, until our appliances for transportation, for hospitals, and for supplies are the marvel of the civilized world as well as of this country.

This bill makes liberal provision for hospitals. The enlargement of the Army means larger hospitals. The management of distant posts, some of them with a rather troublesome climate, means the nation must take care of its men when they get home, and we make no apology for giving an appropriation of \$455,000 for hospitals; nor do we make any apology for asking that not to exceed \$50,000 may be spent on any one building. The present limit of \$20,000 goes back I have forgotten how many years.

Mr. HULL. Fifty years.

Mr. PARKER. It goes back fifty years. Twenty thousand dollars fifty years ago would have built a great deal more of a building than \$50,000 will now, and the requirements for hospitals have increased in their variety and their expense. That law ought to be repealed with reference not only as to hospitals but as to barracks and quarters; but as to hospitals the need is imperative. When a hospital is needed at a particular post, it can not wait for the next Congress to put it up. The power must be given to the honest officers of the United States to take care of our sick soldiers and to build the buildings which are necessary for them.

This bill also contains provision for a general hospital here in the city of Washington. It is well known that the little general hospital which used to be down at the Washington Barracks somehow gathered about itself and near itself the most expert corps of surgeons in the United States, who without much means got together a library, which any of us can go and visit, where the books have to be put in piles upon the floor for want of stacks, but where by exchange and an appropriation of only a few thousand dollars a year they have gotten together a library on medical subjects which is as fine as any in the civilized world, and which has been thrown open to every reputable physician throughout the United States who chooses to send for a book. That library, that organization, is threatened by the fact that the barracks are now to be taken for the Engineer School, and these physicians therefore ask that they may be given money to have a general hospital for special cases, for the purpose of instruction in connection with the Army Medical School for enlisted men, Hospital Corps, and for nurses, and to serve for a base hospital in time of war.

That appropriation is to be \$400,000. Not a dollar is to be spent until the Secretary of War is satisfied and determines that the whole building, including plans and grounds, can be completed for that sum. There, too, is a new training school for the surgical part of the Army, for its nurses, stewards, and doctors for bringing together and massing army surgical information. This, too, is part of the recent reorganization of the Army of the United States, to which I have referred and of which we can feel so proud because we are willing and have been willing to follow in the lead of the greatest Secretary of War, I think, the country has ever seen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will notice that I have made no formal or set speech in this matter; I have simply followed this bill. Almost every word of it states to the House something new

in the new Army of the United States, and it is in none more particularly to be noted than in this matter of schools. The Engineer School in the city of Washington is new. The War College is new, but when I get to the Ordnance Department of the United States we strike for the first time another novelty in the management of the Army of the United States. It is a matter of a hundred years' history how difficult it has been to bring the Army and the militia together, what jealousy on the part of the Army there was of the militia, what an express contempt they sometimes had for them as mere "play soldiers," what a difficulty there was also in obtaining funds for the militia from the United States, and how little attention was paid to their training. Our great Secretary has changed all that.

It is only two years ago that we had one camp in which the Army and militia worked together. Of course before that single companies had been sent to various State camps, but we had one large United States camp two years ago. Last year we had two camps, and troops from the neighboring States came to those camps in large numbers, participated for the first time in the maneuvering of a large body of troops, and were given the problems, to a certain extent, that would come in actual warfare. They came to know the Regular Army officers as their brothers and to learn from them and to know them, and it is something even if men only came to look in each other's faces and find they are all Americans, though one came from civil life and the other from West Point, as it may be, or from a rise from the ranks.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not go so far as to establish permanent camps. We have not been able to settle finally where these should be or how much they should cost. We have made haste slowly; but it is something in this bill to find, under ordnance stores and supplies, that we appropriate \$585,000 for the purpose of giving ten batteries of the newest field artillery for use by the militia—the National Guard of the United States. During the last twenty years, I might better say during the last thirty years, there has been, perhaps, nothing in our Army that has been more behind other countries, until recently, than the matter of field artillery, except, perhaps, that of small arms. In the Spanish war we sent our volunteer troops into the field with black powder instead of smokeless powder, so that every gun shot told where our men were. We sent them with a rifle that did not carry to the ranges that are now usual. We sent them with a rifle that had no magazine to be used at close quarters, and we sent them with field guns which were, it is true, breech-loaders, and shot well and straight, but which took about three minutes to aim, because when they were fired they kicked themselves out of position.

We were told from year to year by the ordnance department that they were experimenting in the improvement of these field guns; that a nonrecoil carriage was supposed to be used by foreign nations, but it was not perfected, and they were not satisfied and were still experimenting. Thus we had no guns fit for modern warfare and ready to be fired as the best recoil carriage gun can be, ten or fifteen times a minute, preserving the same aim. Year after year I have arisen in this House and put questions upon the fortification bill as to whether these carriages were being perfected, and they were always being improved and not perfected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have the pleasure of being able to assure the Members of this House that the carriages are being manufactured, the guns are being manufactured, and not only are we able to furnish enough for the whole Regular Army, but we are ready to give ten batteries of six guns every year to the militia. A battery will take care of at least 2,000 men. A gun fires so many more shots nowadays than it did in old times that instead of allowing five or six guns to a thousand men, you can now allow three. One battery of six guns will thus take care of 2,000 men. The ten batteries will take care of 20,000 men, and even if these guns should go out of fashion at the end of five years, we would in these five years supply artillery for a hundred thousand men.

There is no item of which we can be prouder than of such an item as this. I believe, and the people of this country believe, that in case of a great war we should have to put a million men into the field, and that our Regular Army would only be the first fighting line even if we ran the companies up to 120 men and doubled and trebled that Army. Everyone knows that. But in case of such a war the first requirement is that we should have arms to arm our men. We have enlarged our gun factories; that also is a new thing. There is a new gun factory at Rock Island as well as one at Springfield. The capacity of these two gun factories, working with one-half force on one shift of eight hours, is 105,000 guns a year, and we are making them at a cost of \$1,700,000.

If it be assumed, which I do not assume, that these guns are to go out of fashion in five years—it may be, invention is very quick in this country—if it be assumed that they go out of fashion in five years, it is the cheapest \$1,700,000 the Government ever spent.

It will supply 105,000 guns a year, which is 500,000 in five years. One thousand seven hundred men will cost \$1,700,000 a year; according to the average, a thousand dollars to a man in round numbers to keep in the field, whereas by this provision we shall in five years be enabled in an emergency to put 500,000 men in the field. We can do so now with the Krag-Jørgensen gun.

I am proud of the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs three or four years ago when it got a report from the Secretary of War and an estimate from the Secretary of the Treasury, I think for \$800,000, said that was not enough, and that by the votes of this House the appropriation was more than doubled in order to put arms in the hands of freemen in the time of war.

The Boer war in South Africa, conducted by a poor people, shows that the cheapest expense which is ever suffered by a free people is in providing arms to be used in a case of emergency. Not in maintaining large standing armies, not in unnecessarily taking the men away from their work to drill them every year, but in providing the implements of warfare.

You may trust American intelligence to learn, but you can not make guns and small arms immediately in case of necessity, nor as well as you can make them if it be done beforehand. You are not as safe. I am proud, likewise, to be able to assure the House that in case of necessity six times as many arms could be made. We are working half force on a single shift of eight hours. If we work full force on three shifts of eight hours we can make six times as many guns, or 600,000 in a year. Factories for the making of arms have been more than doubled in their capacity since I have been in the House and since the period of which we speak and under the superintendence of our Secretary of War. It is entirely in accord with what I have just been saying that we have made liberal provision in this bill for the transportation and other expenses of the militia attending the large Government camps and for the pay of men during the week or ten days that they will be there.

It is entirely in accord with what I have said and with the whole principles of management of the War Department by this Secretary of War that he believes in training the whole people how to shoot, and that in this and in the previous bill he insisted on having a provision giving twenty-five hundred dollars a year for the purpose of a trophy, medals, and prizes for good marksmanship. It is in accord with the principles of the Secretary of War of making brothers of all the arms of the United States that he asks this year that the House shall order that he may open the competition for those prizes, some of them, not merely to the Army and to the militia, as was provided for in the old law, but also to the Navy and the Marine Corps; and he desired what we did not yet feel willing to do, that there should be some prizes for outsiders who are in rifle clubs. We may not have been right in refusing that. It will be for the House to say. They may amend the bill in that particular. There is something to be said in favor of reserving those prizes for those who, like the men of the National Guard, show their willingness to belong to organizations which can be called on in time of need.

Let me close by saying that I have departed from my usual rule of saying nothing upon an appropriation bill in general debate, wherein it is to be assumed that the Members of this House know generally that we must provide for the Army; but on this occasion, at such a time as this, when our great Secretary of War is leaving his office, with the thanks of every man in the country for work well, earnestly, and intelligently done; for the sympathy and brotherhood that he has shown for departments that previous to this were thought outside of the ken of the Secretary of War; for his sympathy with the National Guard and with the militia; for his desire to bring all the forces of the nation together; for his determination to maintain the privileges of the officers of the line, and to give to those officers and not to peculiar favorites the right to be in the city of Washington or on staff detail, where they may enjoy society and meet their fellows, instead of being sent off to forts on the plains, where they are left alone and where nothing is done for them—I say, at this time, when the man who took a retainer, as he said, as counsel of the Army of the United States and has stood by that client of his during all these years, is now about to retire, it is only right and proper to go over the items of this appropriation bill and to let this House and the country know how many of those items, from the beginning to the end, have felt the hand and have been bettered by the work of that Secretary, by the interest of our President, and by the intelligence, painstaking, conservative judgment and action especially of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, under whom all the members of the committee on both sides of the House feel that it is an honor and a pleasure to have served. [Applause.]

MR. THAYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman this question, as to whether he can tell me what has been the expense of transportation of troops to and from the Philippine Islands during the last year?

Mr. PARKER. I will say that it is given in the Quartermaster-General's report in detail. I never can remember figures. In that report there is given in detail exactly the cost of the army transport service, and likewise how much was saved by it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think it is also set out in the hearings.

Mr. THAYER. I refer to the cost to and from the Philippine Islands. Is not that all together in the report?

Mr. PARKER. I don't know whether that can be segregated or not. I doubt it. The detailed cost of transportation is given in the report of the Secretary of War, and the special cost of transport service is given in the report of the Quartermaster-General. By taking these two together I think the gentleman can get what he desires.

Mr. THAYER. Then I can not find, as I understand it, the information I seek, the specific charges to and from that place.

Mr. PARKER. I think the gentleman will have to inquire at the Quartermaster-General's Department for that. I will be pleased to answer any other question that I can from any other Member. I wish to thank the gentlemen of the committee for their attention during this rather long talk.

Mr. HULL. I would now ask the gentleman on the other side to consume some of his time.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wish to place myself this morning in the amiable attitude of a "chief" asking questions. I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, and your colleagues upon the western side of this Chamber—the side of the setting sun by the way [laughter]—just exactly upon what you are "standing pat" and just what things are among the exceptions to the "stand pat" policy.

On the 15th day of January—a year ago—the House of Representatives almost unanimously passed a bill putting anthracite coal upon the free list for good, and giving a rebate of duties upon all other coals for the period of one year from and after the passage of the act. Some weeks ago I introduced into this House two bills which I shall insert in the RECORD. The first of them was entitled "A bill to relieve from taxation coal imported from foreign countries."

The second was to provide rebate of duties on coal for one year longer, thereby giving to you and your colleagues upon the west side of the Chamber your choice as to which one of these two things you would do. I hardly thought you would be bold enough to put anything on the free list, even if the article did not, even from a protectionist standpoint, need any "protection." You are so afraid of the word "free." But I did think that perhaps, having yourselves passed a bill to rebate duties for one year upon coals other than anthracite—under the whip and spur of public necessity, when you flinched like cowards and did what you did not want to do—I thought you might perhaps, for the sake of consistency, be willing to continue that law in existence for one year longer.

I thought this all the more, Mr. Chairman, because that year of rebate of duties upon coals other than anthracite had furnished to the bituminous coal miners and coal mining corporations of this country an object lesson of the fact that with those classes of coal upon the free list there was no death and no "destruction" and no "soup houses" connected with mining coal within the United States of America. I thought so all the more because the proof had been fully brought out before a committee appointed by this House that coal had been reduced to the American purchaser directly and immediately in consequence of the passage of that act. I thought that even Republicans were willing to reduce taxation to the American consumer if they could do it without materially hurting any favored class.

Here are the two bills I introduced. They meet the approbation of the Democrats in this House, and were introduced not without consultation with such of them as I could conveniently reach.

A bill to relieve from taxation coal imported from foreign countries.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act no duty shall be levied or collected upon coal of any form or description imported into the United States from foreign countries.

A bill to provide rebate of duties on coal.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to make full rebate of duties imposed by law on all coal now dutiable of every form and description imported into the United States from foreign countries for the period of one year from and after the passage of this act.

Now, in that connection, Mr. Chairman, I have made an assertion which I wish to prove. I hold in my hand the report of the testimony given in an investigation before a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of this House, that committee sitting at Boston, Mass., January 26, 27, and 28, 1903. Before I go on I want to say that in spite of the fact that I had introduced those bills, and that they had been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the 15th day of January—the date of the

expiration of the operation of the rebate law—was permitted to pass without any action by the Committee on Ways and Means. I want to state further that yesterday the bill to continue the rebate one year longer was called up in the committee and was voted down by a strict party vote, every Republican upon the call in committee of yeas and nays recording himself as opposed to relieving the American consumer from taxation upon coal for a year longer, even after a year's experience had demonstrated the relief of the consumer and that the coal miners and coal-mining corporations were still carrying on a highly profitable business.

On page 18 of this report, Mr. Chairman, I find the following, which is brought out by the questions of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McDERMOTT]:

Q. The imposition of 67 cents a ton duty upon coal during the months from May until November was, by reason of the great demand and small supply of domestic coal, a negligible quantity; that is, the demand was so much above the foreign price, plus the cost of bringing it here, that 67 cents did not make a great deal of difference?—A. It was a hardship that the consumer should not have been obliged to pay, anyway.

Q. Do you think the consumer paid 67 cents?—A. You take a man that, is consuming coal; he had to pay that 67 cents and burn it up in the furnace.

Q. I am trying to agree with you that he pays 67 cents.—A. I know he does, because he gives Uncle Sam a check for it.

By the way, I wish to say that these are all unwilling witnesses. If you will observe the course of the examination, you will see that the truth is corkscrewed out of them; they are not volunteering the truth.

I read further:

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Has there been any imported coal since the duty has been taken off?—A. I think there has been 150,000 tons bought.

Q. Has there been any reduction in price of imported coal?—A. The prices run all the way from \$4.15 to \$7.50 for anthracite.

Q. Has there been any apparent reduction in price of the imported coal to the consumer or jobber?—A. I think there has. I think originally we paid \$5.50, delivered in the harbor here, for what we call admiralty small; that is, culm, that the American user would not put into—

Q. What does that cost now?—A. I think we can buy that in the neighborhood of \$4.12 or \$4.15, delivered here.

One dollar and thirty-eight cents reduction on the poor man's ton of coal at a time when New England was threatened with being frozen to death! That is the evidence of a coal dealer in Boston.

Q. Has there been any decrease of the price of domestic coal during that time?—A. I think the market has weakened a trifle.

Q. What do you mean?—A. That coal has brought \$7.25 in Philadelphia and it is now down to \$6.50, no material difference.

No material difference, says this witness. Seventy-five cents a ton to poor people who are all the time upon the verge of starvation, not knowing to-day precisely how much they are going to get to-morrow, nor how many hours' work they are going to get—seventy-five cents a ton in the opinion of this gentleman is a mere trifle!

Mr. PALMER. What is the date of this examination, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I read it at the beginning. It was January 26, 27, and 28, 1903.

Mr. PALMER. That was after the strike was over—two months after the coal strike was over.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I don't remember the exact date when the coal strike was "off." The question was asked if the reduction did not take place at once, as I will show you in a moment, and the man says yes. Now, let me come to another witness. And by the way, I will turn to one now directly answering the point made by the gentleman. On page 140 I read:

By Representative McDERMOTT:

Q. When you sell Nova Scotia coal—

Now, mark this, my friend from Pennsylvania—is it the custom of the trade to quote prices plus the duty?

This is the examination of Mr. Edward M. Allen, a coal dealer.

Q. When you sell Nova Scotia coal is it the custom of the trade to quote prices plus the duty?—A. My people established the precedent of making the price—

Mark it now—

alongside in bond.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me first finish this answer of the witness:

It is rather difficult with a number of New Englanders to get that expression thoroughly understood.

Q. Just what do you mean by it?—A. I mean we sell the coal at so much, delivered at Portland. The consignee assumes the duty. Of course, if that was to be reshipped to Portland, to go back into Canada, and it is frequently handled in that way—that is, shipped in bond, discharged at Portland without paying any duty—and goes right through there; but when it stays in this country the duty has to be paid, and the consignee pays that.

In other words, their custom of trade was to sell the coal "alongside in bond" without adding the duty and to leave the American purchaser to pay the duty, and nobody who is not a fool suspects that he did not add it on when he sold it to the consumer.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose the gentleman is aware of the fact that the average price of coal for the past six months in the United

States, with this duty suspended or taken off, has been greater than it was for the six months prior to the strike?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am aware of that, and I am aware of another thing—

Mr. PAYNE. Wait a moment. Let me ask my question. Does not that show that it is not the addition or the subtraction of the duty that makes the difference in the price, but demand and supply?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What a skillful word player my friend is. Does he suppose that because I say that the duty upon coal adds to its price that I mean to say that demand and supply from other sources than imported coal are not also factors in the price? I do not mean to say any such thing; but what I do mean to say is that although the condition of demand and supply has been such as to make the price of coal higher than it was in the period of industrial peace prior to the strike, in the equal period of time selected by the gentleman, that it would have been approximately sixty-odd cents per ton still higher if that duty had not been taken off. Now, listen to another man under oath.

Mr. PAYNE. Wait a moment. I have not the exact date in my mind, but I think the time has already expired in which that duty was taken off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; on January 15, five days ago, and I suppose that just as soon—

Mr. PAYNE. Has the price of coal jumped up 67 cents a ton on account of that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This was anthracite coal that he was talking about, and that has not jumped up because it is still on the free list.

Mr. PAYNE. Any kind of coal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The other duty was about 40 cents.

Mr. PAYNE. You see your argument does not bear the statement of facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, but the argument *will* bear the statement of facts. Five days is not long. Wait and see. Power to charge will be followed by charging, either before or after the election. They may possibly keep down the price until after the election, so that you, their political friend, can keep in the saddle and thereby make their seat firmer and more permanent. If the gentleman will listen until I finish this question and answer, he will see that my statement is borne out by sworn testimony. Then I will finish answering his question about that.

Q. The purchaser?—A. The purchaser.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where it remains in bond?—A. Where it remains in bond.

Then a question by Mr. McDERMOTT:

Q. What was the price before the duty was removed?—A. I have just quoted the price; before the duty was removed.

Q. Just give me the figures again.—A. I said it sold in normal times in the neighborhood of \$3 a ton alongside in bond.

Note—"in normal times."

Remember this term, "alongside in bond," meant without the duty being paid by the foreign seller. To go on: "Up to the present time of \$5.50 and \$6 alongside," being a part of witness's reply.

Q. The duty was 67 cents. The price on the last day that the duty was imposed on coal was then 67 cents higher a ton than it was the day following when the duty was off?—A. Anything that was in transit; yes, sir.

Q. In other words, if a citizen of Boston desired to use Nova Scotia coal, he paid 67 cents more a ton on the day before the duty was removed than he would be called upon to pay the day after the duty was removed?—A. Yes, sir.

That answers your question. It is "as wide as a church door" and "as deep as a well."

Mr. PAYNE. That bears no relation to the market price of coal in the United States. And that man seems to be stating his theory, just as the gentleman from Mississippi or any other man might be stating his.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No theory at all. Does not he state that he is a coal dealer? He states a fact under oath.

Mr. PAYNE. The actual price of coal in the United States did not decrease 67 cents the next day in the general market, and everybody knows that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course not everywhere throughout the United States the very next day. There had to be time for the coal to get out from the port of Newport; but it did at Boston. I can not allow the gentleman to make a speech in my time. I yielded for a question. Now I beg the gentleman's pardon. This man is not stating a theory. He is a coal dealer, and he is asked a question as to the price at which he sold coal in Boston the day before the duty was removed and the day after the duty was removed.

Mr. PAYNE. What part of the question indicates he was giving the retail price of the coal he was selling?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He was not giving the retail price; he was giving his wholesale price.

Mr. PAYNE. In what part of it does he say he was giving the wholesale price?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, the part of it that does it, viz, where he says he was the agent of foreign coal companies, importing coal into the United States, I have told it already, and if the gentleman will read the RECORD to-morrow, if he has not listened to me, he will find it.

Mr. PAYNE. I heard what you read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then you heard that this man is not stating a theory. He said he was a coal dealer, selling the coal less the duty cheaper the very next day after its removal, and he tells you why. It was the custom of the business to sell to the American purchaser without counting the duty "alongside in bond," and when the American purchaser went to get his coal he had to pay the duty. That is not a theory but a fact, and coming from a man who was selling the coal. That is not all. Here is some more of this. And I will put more into the RECORD after I am through with what I am reading. Here is another witness; let us see who he is. Edwin Hamlin. Now mark this:

Q. You are importing right along coal from England?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What effect has the recent legislation had upon the price?

A. We reduced our price, I think, last week, on account of that, on the foreign coal. There is practically no American domestic coal in this market. It is practically out of the market, our domestic bituminous coal.

Mark the unwillingness of the witness: "I think," forsooth.

The other I read you was about anthracite. Now this is about bituminous coal:

Q. And there has been no reduction in price on the bituminous already, has there?

A. Yes.

Evidently that was not the way they wanted him to answer. He said:

They call for bituminous coal and we sell it as bituminous, whether domestic or foreign.

Q. The reduction has been horizontal?—A. But it takes effect on the foreign coal because there is very little American coal in this market.

Q. (By Mr. McDERMOTT.) The consumer has received the benefit of the removal of the tariff?—A. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Q. (By the CHAIRMAN.) What was the reduction?—A. One dollar a ton. That was not wholly on account of the tariff; that was on account of the easing off of freights in addition to the tariff. They eased off about that time.

Now mark the mathematics of it:

Q. How much?—A. You can get freights from Norfolk and Newport News at \$1.00. They were \$2 and along there. And that, with the removal of the duty, makes up what we consider the difference in the cost—of the dollar.

Now, if the course of trade had been perfectly just it would have made up \$1.07 reduction, but the coal dealers stole 7 cents on the way, because they naturally did not want to reduce any more than they were forced, and other factors in the state of the market enabled them to stop short of the full reduction.

Mr. PAYNE. If I remember correctly, there was a syndicate of some kind formed in Boston about that time for the purpose of selling coal to poor people at cost.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This man is not a syndicate. Mr. PAYNE. I would like to know whether this man came in competition with that syndicate or not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, no; the gentleman can not get out of it in that way. The syndicate bought at wholesale from importers and dealers, like this man, and retailed to the poor, and their object was to give the poor, the full benefit of the reduction and to force retailers to do so. I am informed that they succeeded measurably well.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. LACEY. That is this: On the general subject of prices being paid by the tariff, in the condition of all of our people having suspended work, whether those conditions were such as one could form a clear idea in regard to taking the duty off coal, as was proposed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What?

Mr. LACEY. At that time our men were producing no coal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well.

Mr. LACEY. And therefore we had no domestic competition, and in buying foreign coal the price would go up on account of the tariff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well.

Mr. LACEY. But if at the same time we were producing coal the tariff would cut very little figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would it not? Let me see. Suppose I was then importing Nova Scotian or Welsh coal and the gentleman from Iowa were selling domestic coal in the same market, and he sent his coal to Boston and I imported mine thither, will he tell me that when I could go in the market and sell my coal 40 cents or 67 cents cheaper, that he would not have to do one of two things, either quit business or meet my price? Why, of course.

Now, my friends, I arose, as I stated, simply in the amiable rôle of a "chiel" asking questions. I want to ask you this: If you are "standing pat" on everything, why did you not stand pat on that? [Applause on Democratic side.] Why did you not go on and give us at least another year of the rebate? Was it because you were afraid that you would hurt the feelings of the coal barons of the United States, because, although they had not been crippled, although they had not been destroyed, they had been deprived, the anthracite men, to the extent of 67 cents and the bituminous men to the extent of the duty, of some of their power to extort an unfair and an unduly high price from the American consumer? Were you afraid that, their feelings being hurt, they would not contribute to the approaching campaign fund? Did they rather intimate that they would not rustle at the election unless you showed a nestling disposition before the election?

Now, my friends, what are you "standing pat" on? To what extent are you "standing pat?" You are "standing pat" upon the revision of the tariff until after the election, you tell me, and, by the way, while we are talking about "standing pat," I saw the other day that the "Great I Am" of the Republican party made a speech in which he said, "Fellow-citizens, we hold the ace." Now, I had a private and confidential conversation with a gentleman connected with the Clerk's office of the House this morning who has had official reasons to advise himself concerning the phraseology of cards, and he tells me he does not know of a single game of cards in the world where the ace wins. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PALMER. Do you want to know what we are "standing pat" on?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. On a straight flush.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh! you are; well, of course I do not know what a straight flush is, but before I get through, in a minute, if I have time, I am going to prove that whether you have got a "straight" or not—and things do not look very straight in the Post-Office Department, nor in the Public Lands Bureau, nor about some of our Indian affairs—whether you have a "straight" or not, or whether your "flush" is a "bobtail" or not, things are not quite as "flush" as you think they are, or as you would have the country believe. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Your talk about dinner pails and prosperity and such things is not quite as loud and ubiquitous as it was a while back.

Now, to proceed with my questions—and they are amiable questions and very good-natured questions; they are intended to satisfy my own lack of information—you say you are "standing pat" on the tariff. The President says so, because he omits all question of the tariff in this lugubrious and long-winded and singular document, the message of the President the last time. He says you are standing pat pretty well upon that subject, and upon reciprocity because, to the best of my recollection, he does not say one word about tariff revision or reciprocity in that connection. Now, gentlemen, I want to read you a few lines, or perhaps I had better insert it in the RECORD, from the Washington Post of December 14, quoted from the Providence Journal, a very great paper of this country, which is headed "A Hushed Administration." Read it, all of you. Italics are mine. Here it is:

[From the Providence Journal.]

THE HUSHED ADMINISTRATION—SIGNIFICANT SILENCE ON THE QUESTIONS OF TARIFF AND CURRENCY REFORM.

Outspoken and even noisy as the Administration is on such subjects as the upbuilding of the Navy, the supervision of corporations, and the construction of an interoceanic canal, something or somebody has completely silenced it on those still unsettled and important questions of domestic policy—the tariff and the currency. We may say silenced, because the only alternative explanation would be that it either is unaware of the existence of these questions or has no views upon them, which a decent respect for our titular rulers compels us to consider inconceivable.

Indeed, if Senator HANNA, representing the overprotected manufacturers, who must not be made too restless for the frying pan, and Senator ALDRICH, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, with other duties annexed, both acutely mindful of the approach of a national election—if these influential party leaders had gone to the President and specifically ordered him to hush up all tariff and currency questions, the result would have been so precisely like what we now see that it is only with extreme difficulty that one can avoid thinking that that was just what happened.

"S-s-sh!" these eminent Senators and their associates in party leadership may be conceived as saying in the inner political council chambers of late, whenever the project of doing something with either the tariff or the currency or both has been mentioned to them. And hushed the Administration has certainly been. "An election is close at hand; our party is not united on either of these questions; let us do nothing to stir up trouble and expose our weakness," we may easily imagine them saying. And if this advice was given and the Administration had obediently accepted it, we should have had just such annual communications to Congress, and through Congress to the country, as this week we have had.

The last of them, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, was placed before the House yesterday, and it contains absolutely no discussion or recommendation regarding the tariff and only the briefest and lightest passing suggestion that the currency is not perfect. Remembering that the Secretary has a good knowledge of at least one of these subjects and pronounced views thereupon, which he has been free to express publicly all through the past year, the reader of his report can fairly hear somebody's "S-s-sh!" whispering through its slumberous pages.

Mr. Shaw sees a surplus of only \$14,000,000 for the current year, and for next

year his figures lead him to predict a deficit of \$23,000,000. He must know that a continued insufficiency of revenue will make possible a return of the peril from the silver element in the monetary system; yet he has not a word to say of the need of any consideration of revenue problems. He recognizes that "our currency system is nonelastic" and that "this defect should be remedied." But when and how? He gives not a hint, even, on these points, confining himself to the superfluous warning that we want no money that is not sound. This silence is the more notable because from the times of Chase, McCulloch, and Sherman, to those of Manning, Fairchild, and Gage, the reports of the Secretaries of the Treasury form an unbroken series of state papers on finance, comprehensive in treatment, often extremely able in construction, and earnestly and honestly intended to direct public thought and guide Congressional action in the paths of sound economics.

That leadership in finance which has hitherto been proudly assumed by administrations of each party in the conscientious, courageous, and independent discharge of public duty has been completely abandoned by the Roosevelt Administration. It is hushed into silence on the two most vital questions of domestic concern; and as this silence is apparently just what is desired by the most powerful leaders of the upper branch of Congress one must stop thinking about the novel situation altogether to be saved from reaching the unwelcome conclusion that the Administration has abdicated leadership in this respect in favor of that "overshadowing Senate" which has now come, through the facile submission of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury, to usurp some of the most important functions of even the Executive Department.

So the President says by his silence, "We are standing pat on these two great questions."

There is another man, a very distinguished gentleman from the State of my friend, Mr. LACEY, from Iowa, who, on December 11, is quoted as maintaining his views: "Governor Cummins repeats demand for reciprocity, for tariff revision also—Address to the executive board at Boston, Mass., association banquet." Such is the heading of the editorial in the Washington Post, December 11. Let me read it:

GOVERNOR CUMMINS'S ADDRESS.

Charles S. Hamlin was then called upon to read the address of Governor Cummins. The governor's address follows:

"It goes without saying that we ought to, if we can, secure treaties that will hurt nobody, but to allow an interest that puts a million dollars of goods annually into our markets to stand in the way of a series of interests putting ten millions of dollars of goods into a foreign market, is turning the doctrine of protection from a beneficent policy, which bestows its largess upon the country as a unit, into an instrument of avarice and selfishness. It must not be understood that I am for any trade arrangement that would strike down any industry whose existence is necessary to make us independent of other nations in so far as our natural resources can make us independent. Here again the principles which I invoke sway the situation—the good of the people.

"The reciprocity which I advocate is the reciprocity for which, I believe, Blaine expended his maturest wisdom, and which he illuminated with the best thought of his ripest years. It is the reciprocity which McKinley saw as he uttered his last word to the American people. It is the only reciprocity which will aid our producers in their struggle for the trade of the world, and if we are not ready to stand for it, and fight for it, we ought to consign the word and the thought to the oblivion of outgrown heresies.

"It has often been said that our manufacturers sell their product abroad cheaper than they sell it at home, and some prejudice has arisen upon this phase of the problem. I do not intend to inquire whether the charge be true or false, for to me it is a matter of utter indifference whether they sell at higher or lower prices in foreign markets than they sell in their home markets, provided always that our tariff laws do not permit them to sell at home for more than a fair American price without meeting with the competition of other lands. Our tariff schedules should be so adjusted that our producers can pay American compensation for the work of production, reward the capital invested with a fair American profit, and then the American buyer or consumer will never pay more than he ought to pay; for the foreign competitor can enter whenever the prices rise above this point.

"In my opinion some of the schedules of the law of 1897 are too high, and during the period of overwhelming demand, which we have witnessed in the last three or four years, our home producers have been able to exact more than a fair price for what they have sold. I recognize the difficulties of preparing tariff schedules so that they will answer with accuracy the abstract test, and we may not look for absolute perfection, yet the disparity is so great in some things that I have believed, and still believe, that, without regard to reciprocal treaties, there should and must be a revision of these schedules.

"THE HABIT OF SHIVERING."

"I deprecate the habit of shivering into which we are in danger of falling. Why should the business interests of the United States be taught to tremble whenever it is proposed to modify trade regulations along the lines of greater home production? I refuse to believe that our industrial and commercial structure rests upon a foundation so insecure. I refuse to believe that there is so utterly a want of confidence in the wisdom of Congress that a proposition to amend our schedules or negotiate a trade treaty would terrify our producers; but if we must either stand still or have a spasm, I still say, move on.

"As I recall it, the negotiations of the McKinley treaty did not paralyze business or arrest enterprise. As I remember the meetings of the Joint High Commission did not disturb the serenity of the public mind, and I do not see that the treaty with Cuba, about to be consummated, has any serious effect upon the stability of industrial affairs. May we not hope, therefore, that we can go quietly on doing the best we can to get better terms in foreign markets and avert threatened retaliations without a quiver of apprehension or a shadow of distrust?

"Let me test the sincerity of those who profess fear that a movement toward reciprocity would dismay, dishearten, and frighten the business men of the country. I take Canada as an illustration. Suppose we could to-night add Canada, from ocean to ocean and from her southern line to the North Pole, to the territory of the United States, so that when some courageous American explorer plants the banner of the Republic upon the axis of the world, and its beautiful folds fill the air of the north, it will proclaim the eternal sovereignty of the United States. How many are there here or elsewhere who would not hail the mighty event as the proudest victory achieved since the old flag was run up over the ramparts of Yorktown?

"How many are there here or elsewhere who would look upon the accession of power and of population, of land and lake and sea, as a misfortune to our country or a blow inflicted upon our prosperity? I go further and eliminate national pride. How many banks would fail on that account? How many factories would close because the Stars and Stripes were flying over this vast domain? What acre would be worth less? What man would be without work or receive less compensation? And yet were it so done, there would be

free trade from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean. Mark you, I am not dreaming of annexation, nor am I advocating free trade with Canada, for the former is more remote than ever before, and the latter is wholly impracticable. I have used the figure only to show that we can safely draw nearer to our neighbor and safely enter upon the negotiation of a reciprocal treaty."

Now, my friends, a little bit later on, on January 15, or a month later, we meet another thing. I am trying to find out, you know, on what and how far you are "standing pat." Some of you say you are standing pat on no revision of the tariff "until after the election," and some say no revision of the tariff at all; and some of you, Governor Cummins, for example, say you are not "standing pat" even that far. You are a little bit shaky on your political legs. This one of January 15 is headed, "New turn to the Iowa idea." "Governor Cummins"—listen to this—"for free trade with Canada." Think of that! I introduced a poor innocent bill here, or a resolution rather, merely asking the President to reconvene, if possible, the Joint High Commission, so that by negotiation between the two countries we might be able to arrive at an amicable trade relationship, and Governor Cummins comes out and wants "free trade with Canada" in natural products, as he explains later on. Listen to this:

NEW TURN TO IOWA IDEA—GOVERNOR CUMMINS FOR FREE TRADE WITH CANADA—OPPOSES THE STAND-PAT POLICY—URGES FARMERS, IN HIS SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS, TO RAISE THE FLAG OF RECIPROCITY—FARMERS' PRINCIPAL DESIRE IS TO FEED AS MANY PEOPLE AS POSSIBLE—PARTY CONTEST LIKELY IN IOWA.

[Special to the Washington Post.]

DES MOINES, IOWA, January 25, 1904.—Governor Cummins gave the "Iowa idea" a new turn to-day, and it now stands for free trade with Canada in the agricultural products and for reciprocity with all the world. In his second inaugural address, which was delivered this afternoon, he told the farmers of Iowa that they would be the gainers by the admission of the agricultural products of Canada into this country, for by so doing he declared a treaty could be entered into which for years to come would "make us practically masters of the imports into that dominion."

IN FAVOR OF PROGRESS.

The governor took occasion to class himself emphatically with those who favor progression, and said he expected that what we will have to-morrow will be better than what we have to-day. He urged the farmers of Iowa, who, he said, have ever been loyal to the principles of protection, to raise in the political heavens the flag of reciprocity, and let the nation know that the people of this State reiterate the demand for reciprocity, which was made clear in the Iowa platform of last year.

"I have never been a disciple of the doctrine expressed in a phrase that has now become famous: 'Let well enough alone,'" declared the governor. "Abstractly viewed, the maxim is beyond criticism, but its fatal weakness lies in the fact that there never was nor will be a day in which it was or will be well enough with any community, with any State, or with any nation. When any society ceases to grow better, it has begun to grow worse. There is no such thing as rest in the economy of the universe, and no such thing as 'stand pat' in the order of the living world."

FARMERS NEED MARKETS.

"It is obvious that the farmer's principal desire and paramount interest is to feed as many people as possible. They sell breadstuffs and meats in their various forms both at home and abroad and, therefore, they ought to be in favor of a policy which will maintain and multiply their markets in their own country and protect and increase their markets in other countries. Let us not be content with mere abstractions. It has been possible to make, and in my judgment it is still possible to make, a treaty with Canada which would for years to come make us practically masters of the imports into that dominion. In the last ten years American manufacturers have expended one hundred millions of dollars in the establishment of plants in Canada, which would have been kept at home, with all the labor which that implies, if there had been a fair and permanent relation existing between the two countries."

The inaugural address of Governor Cummins provoked considerable comment among politicians to-night. Everyone conceded it to be a strong document, but it was taken by the "stand-patters" as being aimed directly at them, and as indicating there would be no compromise on the part of the governor and his friends in regard to the selection of delegates to the Republican national convention.

"In favor of progress!" What language from a member of the "stand-still party!" "Farmers need a market." Whoever heard of a modern-day Republican caring what farmers need? Farmers can't contribute to a campaign fund. They are good in times of peace only to pay taxes on axes, hoes, shovels, plows, mowers, harvesters, barbed wire, wire nails, and cotton gins.

Now, my friends, this began to touch, this began to hurt, and this began to make the men who believe in the stand-pat theory all around, flinch very considerably; and so the next day in the Washington Post, on January 16, there is an interview with Senator GALLINGER, a stand-pat-all-around-and-forever Republican, headed, "No free trade with Canada—Senator GALLINGER thinks Governor Cummins's suggestion is absurd."

That language of Senator GALLINGER is almost beyond the limits of parliamentary debate. [Laughter.]

The Senator says:

The admission of agricultural products would be disastrous to the farming community all along the border.

And when I read his article, he says with a "My Heavens" understood, I suppose:

Our imports from Canada in the present year will reach about fifty-five millions.

Fifty-five millions! And Governor Cummins's idea is absurd, because it would flood the markets of the United States with what fifty-five millions of Canadian products now imported might portend!

Why, my friends, not all of these imports are agricultural. About three-fifths of them probably were. Make it about thirty-

odd millions of dollars of agricultural products as a basis from which we are to be flooded. Why, do you know if you take the whole fifty-five millions as a basis, it is not the value of Mississippi's cotton crop last year, and yet he wants us to believe that we are to be ruined, "soup housed." I dare say, however, that the same man if he were faced by a treaty proposition to-morrow, whereby Great Britain and Canada both consented that Manitoba and Alberta and the Hudson Bay country and the Red River country up there should be peaceably annexed to the United States by the payment to Great Britain of twenty or fifty millions of dollars, would take them with all the products they could send.

Our sons are going there; their sons are coming here, and we absolutely stand here and forbid our children there and their children here to trade across the line, and men, a distinguished statesman among them, try with a bugaboo like that, with a threat of \$55,000,000 of farm produce, to make the American people, who have already come into competition with Minnesota and Michigan and South Dakota, North Dakota, and the great western country shiver in their boots! The Senator says nothing about the millions of our agricultural produce going yearly to Canada. My friends, I have heard you here on your feet talking time and time again vaingloriously about "expansion," and when it is real and true expansion of homogeneous populations and contiguous territories I agree with you that our country is benefited by it and that her history in connection with it is thrilling and glorious. The hand that signed the treaty with Napoleon the Great, giving to the United States everything west of the Mississippi River except the Spanish and British northwestern possessions, is an immortal hand for many reasons, but it would have been an immortal hand if it had never done anything else. Yet in that day there stood up narrow men upon this floor and said, "Oh, my heavens, the industries of the East will be swamped!" "O ye men of little faith" and of little industrial courage, and of little confidence in American labor and brains!

Mr. WATSON. May I ask my friend a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I ask for information as to the gentleman's attitude: I do not ask it at all in a controversial spirit. Does the gentleman believe in reciprocity with Canada or in absolute free trade between the United States and Canada? I would like to have the gentleman define his position in that particular.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My private position? My position as related to practical politics, or my private academic position as a student of abstract political science? [Laughter.] Seriously, I am glad the gentleman has asked a question. As a practical man, as a practical legislator, standing upon this floor for the purpose of doing practical things, which under the decisions of the Supreme Court can be done, not I nor anybody else is a free trader or could be.

If the gentleman wants to know my opinion as a student of political economy about the abstract question of free trade, I think that the nearer the nations of the earth can come to leaving their commerce totally untrammelled the happier and the better and the more prosperous the entire world will be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But I know what you want. You want to raise up amongst a lot of people the boggy man of "free trade." What a terror it is to a highwayman to be faced with the fear of having to drop his booty. You know, and I ask you if you do not know, that under the decision of the Supreme Court setting aside the income tax, no party in this country could get along without a very high rate of import duties, even if it wanted to cut them down.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I imagine not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I imagine not.

Mr. WATSON. And I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that, and I wanted then later to ask the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will first tell you just the limits to which we can get along without import duty, just the line of demarcation beyond which those duties are robbery and within which they are legitimate taxation, because they are taxation, and like all taxation a necessary evil after all. I have stated it once before upon the floor of this House during the extra session or at the beginning of this, I have forgotten just when, but I will repeat the phrase again: You have a right to levy import taxation or any other sort of taxation upon the citizen, you have a right to burden him—it is a burden—you have a right to weigh him down—it is a weighing down—just to the extent of the necessities of a government carried on economically, constitutionally, and effectively, and above that you have no right to do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Above that, you not only have no governmental right, but it ceases to be moral; it becomes robbery, a crime under the thin cloak of law. The moment that the Government takes one dollar out of my pocket that is not needed for public purposes, that

Government has taken advantage of its power, as a highwayman does, to hold me up and rob me. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my friend, on that point, if that brings him back to the old idea of a tariff for revenue only, as advocated originally by his party?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; it does not bring your friend back. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Or does it bring him to the proposition that he is in favor of a protective tariff that will be equal to the difference in wages in this country and in Europe?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, I see; I can answer that very easily.

Mr. WATSON. All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Any tariff that will provide for the necessities of this Government is more than equal to a tariff that must equal, even transcend, the difference of wages in the United States and abroad. This is especially true when you consider that the whole world's pauper labor, except Chinese, is itself admitted to the United States free. That is the answer to that, and I am in favor of a tariff that will answer the necessities of this Government. Those two statements are my answer to that question. But let me go on. Now, are you going to stand pat on the tariff? If so, how many of you here and in the country, and how long? Some of you say you are going to stand pat until after the election, and when I ask you why, you tell me "so that the tariff can be revised by its friends."

My friends, if you want the tariff "revised by its friends," and you want to be dead certain that it is "revised by its friends," you had better begin to operate and revise it right now, because, although you may win the next election, and although we know as sensible men that we are going to have awfully hard up-hill work in turning you down, if we turn you down at all, you can depend upon it that you have more power now and an extortionate tariff has more friends right now in this Hall and in the other wing of this Capitol than it will have after the next election.

If the friends of this sort of tariff want to deal with this question—if they want to see that this robber "child" is duly nursed and clothed and kept warm, and if they are afraid of us and afraid that it may have a less number of friends hereafter, let them go to work now; there are plenty of you to go to work.

Why are you afraid to tell us and the country what you want to do? Why are you afraid to tell the American people how and on what principle you want to revise the tariff? Why are you afraid to tell them in what direction you would revise it? Why are you afraid to tell them to what extent you would revise it? Why do you not explain the phrase "stand pat?" "Stand pat" how long? And how far—up to the limit or beyond the limit or where? [Laughter.] What in the world is the reason that the tariff can not be "revised by its friends" now? Is there a single one of you over there that is not its friend?

Have you a Senator in the majority that is not its friend? Are you afraid that the President of the United States is not its friend? Are you willing to go before the American people and say that you have "stood pat" upon every bit of the tariff except for one poor little year longer of the rebate on bituminous coal—bituminous coal that the poor seamstress, the poor workingman, the poor sweat-house people, that everybody in the country who is down to the point of threatened submergence, or below it, needs and must have; bituminous coal, which is a necessary of life throughout a great part of the country?

And yet you tell us you "stand pat." When you get to this particular thing, which does not need legislation to change the law and where all you have to do is to sit quiet and let a beneficent act of congress—proved beneficent by a year's experience—expire by limitation, leaving the country to find it out—you have such infinite confidence in the fact that "the people are fools" that you think they will not find it out—there you do not "stand pat." What else are you going to "stand pat" about? Are you going to "stand pat" on Canadian reciprocity—on the failure or refusal to reconvene the joint high commission?

By the way, I introduced some bills upon that subject. They are very innocent bills; but I have not much hope of their getting into this House. Well, I will take that back. I have a hope, proceeding from the good nature and amiability and personal friendship of my friend the leader upon the majority side. Out of pure good nature he may allow the bills to be considered in committee; but I understand that from a party standpoint he disapproves them. Now, here is one, a bill providing that—

The duties upon imports now established by law under the act of July 24, 1897, shall be and hereby are reduced 20 per cent.

Your own Dingley bill says that you can do this. Your own bill admits that a 20 per cent reduction will not do any harm. From your own standpoint as high protectionists, as framers of the Dingley bill, you have said to the country and to the world, "We have put these duties up 20 per cent higher than is necessary, even

for the purposes of protectionism, even for the purposes of the Republican party."

Now, how do you say that?

Mr. PAYNE rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, I am not going back to that old disputed matter about what Mr. Dingley in private conversation said. You said it by inserting a clause in the Dingley bill itself, giving the President power to enter into reciprocity arrangements, reducing duties 20 per cent whenever foreign countries will do certain things. Of course you would not have done that unless you thought the duty could bear a reduction of 20 per cent; and you could not have thought that unless you thought the 20 per cent duty higher than necessary for carrying out your protective policy. In the belly of the Dingley bill stands the confession. I have taken you at your own word, or at the word of confession of your own bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me finish the reading of this bill, because this is a sort of pet of mine.

Mr. PAYNE. While the gentleman is on that 20 per cent business—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me finish the reading of the bill, and then I will yield to the gentleman. This bill provides that these duties may be reduced 20 per cent—on what?

On all articles being the growth and product of such countries as do now or may hereafter admit the natural products of the United States to their markets free of import duty.

Now, before explaining the meaning of the bill, I will yield for a question to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman does not get quite back to the old Morrison bill, making a horizontal reduction of 20 per cent—a bill which was the laughingstock of the country a few years ago. The gentleman is going in that direction; but he does not go quite to the same extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have forgotten—is Mr. Morrison dead?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; he is still alive.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, if he is still alive, I wish you would ask him about that, because it has nothing to do with what I am now discussing.

Mr. PAYNE. That was the position of the Democratic party at that time, and I was curious to know whether my friend from Mississippi was getting back to that position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In the very best natured way I will say that the Democratic party learns as it moves. Some other people do, too. I remember when here in the House of Representatives my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] learned in the course of two or three days that he was totally mistaken about a bill he had himself reported; and I applaud him for learning it, because his last conclusion was right and his first conclusion was totally wrong. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I refer to the Porto Rican legislation which took place in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. PAYNE. I must correct the gentleman, because in that case he thought my last conclusion was wrong. I started out here with a certain form of bill to raise revenues for Porto Rico. I found that with that bill we could not do it, and so I changed the bill; and for that I received a great deal of scoring from the gentleman from Mississippi, although the country finally agreed that the later bill was right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I withdraw the encomium which I passed on the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I am sorry that I can not withdraw the remark I made about the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I got a little confused about the sequence of my facts. I thought it "awfully" funny that I could from a political standpoint indorse any *finality* of the gentleman's judgment. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, this bill that I have read is simply to reduce the duties 20 per cent on products from such countries as may admit our natural productions free. What does that mean? Do you want Mr. Chamberlain to win in Great Britain?

A MEMBER. I do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Nobody does—nobody in America does. Of course his success would trammel our trade in that direction.

No Republican wants it done, because even he believes that trammeling our exports to Great Britain is bad for us. No Democrat wants it done, because he is opposed to trammeling trade in either direction any more than is unavoidable. Now Chamberlain is going to win, in my opinion, just as surely as there is a sun or a moon. He is going to win, because if the whole world is going protection-mad, Great Britain is going to put up a pretense of a tariff at any rate, so that under it she can trade and barter. And when Great Britain puts up that pretense of a tariff—

I do not think she will dare put a tariff on Southern cotton, so I am not speaking from a sectional standpoint, because they have got to have our raw cotton or starve their Manchester and Sheffield and Leeds looms—but she can put a duty upon one-half of the American agricultural products that are shipped into Great Britain, a very small duty upon food products, so as not to cause revolt among her factory operatives, and a higher duty upon other things grown on the farm or dug from the mine; and then she can put any duty she pleases upon such manufactured products as we are sending there now—steel rails and agricultural implements and wire nails, locomotives, sewing machines, typewriters, phonographs, automobiles, and various other things.

My bill, which is approved by the Democracy here, if enacted into law would cut the ground out from under Mr. Chamberlain. The trade of Great Britain with us is more valuable to her than her trade with her colonies. Our trade with her and her colonies is more valuable to us than our trade with all the balance of the world put together.

My friends, when Governor Cummins wrote what he wrote in these articles I have read, there is not a Republican in this country who ought not, if he had been wise and patriotic, even from a purely party standpoint, to have risen to his feet and fairly shouted "a second Daniel come to judgment." He is the only man among you who has had the moral courage to print a word that can save you from the wrath to come; because if Chamberlain does prevail in his ideas in Great Britain, and if Great Britain does cut off the American farmers and millers' market in Great Britain, a market to which we ship over half of all our natural products—products of the mine and of the farm—then you will awaken a storm among the western farmers, compared with which the temporary storm of Populism was absolutely nothing; with this difference, that it will be a storm that will sweep and sweep and sweep until you have been swept out of the way and then alone will it cease to blow. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

How can you defeat Chamberlainism? How can you defeat anything? Anticipate it. Take the situation by the horns; take the bull by the horns, I mean. A situation has no horns, I believe. [Laughter.] Take the bull by the horns and say now by legislation to Great Britain, "We will give you twenty per cent preferential ourselves, as long as you continue your present policy of admitting the products of our mines and our farms free to your shores. We acknowledge that you are the largest market we have in the world, the largest purchasers both in volume and in value, and we are not willing to see our market with you go."

Let me tell you another thing: Protectionism is a thing that grows by feeding on itself. Wherever you start it just in a little bit of a way, and you get one fellow in with a favored industry, and he is growing rich at the public expense and by operation of law, then another fellow comes along and says to his Representative, "I am as good a fellow, and my industry is as respectable an industry as that other one; put me too—even me," "I am an orphan too"—on the list of Government-favored classes." So year after year special favoritism by law grows higher and higher, and broader and broader—that is its history everywhere—until a period of revulsion and reaction comes, and then of course reductions begin, and sometimes the period of revulsion and reaction is so extreme, because it has been so long postponed, that reduction comes by revolution instead of evolution, and works temporary harm and destruction. Now why not deal with that bill? That is an innocent thing. I introduced it so that a Republican could vote for it, I thought.

Let me say another thing. Why, my friends up in New England are talking about the 15 per cent duty on hides. Some of my friends down in the other country whence hides come want to tell me that an American, and above all Americans a Southerner, and above all Southerners a Texan, can not skin dead cattle in competition with a Mexican greaser, and that American prosperity depends upon the skinning of dead cattle! [Laughter.] The truth is that when the dead cattle are skinned, what few of them are skinned out there, except the small number that come from the local butcher shops, are those that die on the plains. The balance of them are skinned in Chicago, or elsewhere, and the hides are sold by the trust, which fixes its own price for the beef without much if any regard to the hide; but those few that do die and are skinned there on the ranch or near the farm in the Southwest are not skinned by Americans at all. They are skinned by greasers under the pay and supervision of some Americans. Greasers come in free. [Laughter.]

Now, these people up in New England are demanding free hides. Well, I do not believe much in putting everything upon the free list. I think it is better to have an all-around tariff. I would not put a great many things upon the free list, but I would list very nearly everything with a tax so small that it would be simply a revenue tax and nothing more—nearly everything except luxuries and things the home produce of which was subject to an excise tax.

Now, I shall not dwell upon the facts and figures of this boot and shoe and hide question, because they were presented to the House most eloquently by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] on the day before yesterday. A great majority of the New England boot and shoe men, as I understand it, say they are willing to go upon the free list themselves if hides are put upon the free list. That is, they say so now, while they are backing a bill to put hides on the free list. I want to test their sincerity, so, after consultation on this side, I introduced, on December 15, 1903, this bill:

A bill to reduce taxation on American citizens who use hides, leather, boots, shoes, saddles, and harness.

Be it enacted, etc., That the following articles are, from and after the passage of this act, freed from all import duties at any port of the United States when imported from any country which admits free of duty identical articles being the product of the United States of America, to wit: Hides of all animals, leather of all sorts, boots, shoes, saddles, and harness. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Now you will note that this is not a bill to put hides, leather, boots and shoes out and out on the free list, although, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] has demonstrated, a majority of the New England boot and shoe manufacturers have expressed a willingness to give up their duty if hides were put on the free list. I was afraid to go that far in a Republican House, where the very whisper of the word "free" causes shivering. The bill admits these articles only from such countries as admit identical articles shipped by us to them free.

In a minority I do not ask all I want; I ask what it seems to me, from your standpoint, you might possibly out of pure love of country grant. Will you grant it? Will you grant something like it? If Texas concedes free hides, will you concede 75 per cent reduction on boots, shoes, harness, and finished leather? Will you concede 50 per cent? Will you do anything for the poor who wear shoes, and who are paying more for an American-made shoe than the American manufacturer charges for the same shoe when bought by men no poorer in London?

Will you "stand pat" against the shoe wearers of America, even when the course of trade proves that the shoemakers of America are flooding the world with their shoes, regardless of the pauper labor of the world?

"Quousque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra," by "standing pat?" But we won't ask now for all that the country has a right to have, because we know we can not get that. Why not take hides and put them on the free list, and reduce the duty of boots, shoes, and harness and leather only 50 per cent? I will wager that you will not even do that, and yet what an insufficient boon that would be. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. Right on that line, the gentleman has said that he did not believe in putting many things on the free list. He has also said that in order to raise enough revenue to run this country that the tariff would amount to more than the difference in the wages in this country and the old country. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman—and he has been very frank to answer as to what he would do if he were in power—would you raise all that revenue by a tariff on the noncompetitive products or scatter it all along the line and put a part of it on competitive products?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I would not only do that, but at the beginning I would necessarily have to leave most of it on the competing products; that is to say, more competing products than noncompeting products would be on the dutiable list.

Mr. WATSON endeavored to interrupt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Wait a moment. If I wanted to take down an old house and build a new one in its place I am not fool enough to blow up the old house by dynamite. I would begin at the roof, the highest part of the house, to take it out of the way. I would begin at the highest and most extortionate schedules of the tariff and gradually remove the present false structure. I am not fool enough, either, to get under the old house and pull down the pillars and let it fall on me. Common sense is an attribute of ordinary citizens, much less statesmen like you and me, you know. [Laughter.]

My idea is this. This tariff ought to be revised. Its inequalities and inequities ought to be at once swept away, and then, gradually, as you can, if I had the power, I would bring about a Democratic tariff. It would take some time to do it. Time would enter as a factor into the process; necessarily so. Great Britain, whose slogan and ultimate aim was free trade—and ours is not free trade, and can not be free trade under the decision of the Supreme Court—did not reach free trade by sweeping out of existence all at once all the industrial conditions that then existed. Gradually, little by little, but with an eye always on the end in view, she reduced the duties, now on this and now on that, and furnished to the country in the case of each reduction an object lesson of the beneficent effect of removing taxation from the consumer.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question here?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have not yet answered your present question.

Now, I believe in a Democratic tariff, and as tariff is taxation on the consumer, I therefore am in favor of making the tariff as nearly as possible equal taxation upon all the consumers; therefore it ought to be a tariff as nearly as possible upon all things consumed, so that all consumers may be taxed equally. The very gist of Democracy, the very nature of Democratic taxation, or Democratic anything else, is equality.

Mr. WATSON. But the gentleman believes to get at once to his ideal of a Democratic tariff would work ruin in this country—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, no; I don't. Of course, a Democratic first tariff bill would not work ruin, because it would be directed by common sense, with such considerations of existing conditions as were necessary.

Mr. WATSON (continuing). Or work injury.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have just been telling you what the Democratic policy was, and was telling that it was not to blow up the house by dynamite nor to pull the house down on our heads.

Mr. WATSON. And that for the present he believed in providing a protective tariff?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No, I did not. There is a protective tariff. All duties on imports are to some extent smacking of protectionism. Of course we would have to leave duties enough to support the Government. Such protectionism as would be left in any possible tariff would be left, not provided, by us.

Mr. WATSON. And a continuation of protection until he could make a Democratic tariff—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No, I did not.

Mr. WATSON. By and by.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It must have been my awkwardness of expression that prevented the gentleman from taking my meaning, because it could not have been any awkwardness or incapability of comprehension on the gentleman's part. I know his ability too well to believe that.

Mr. WATSON. That is very kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I did my very best to express the idea, and I will leave it where it is. I would express it more clearly if I knew how, but I do not know how.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us go ahead. Are you going to "stand pat" on the currency? I want you to tell me that. Now, there seems to be a whole lot of you who want the passage of the Fowler bill; there seems to be a whole lot of you who want the passage of the Aldrich bill, and some of you want a 6 per cent tax on bank currency for an emergency circulation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am a fellow of a modest mind, and I introduced a bill and sent it to the proper committee, the chairman of which is one man that I am looking to more for relief than anybody else, and that bill simply says that where the Government puts United States money in banks and lets them use it, to make them pay some interest on it. That is all. That instead of choosing United States Government depositories by a rule that nobody understands, a rule within the sense of equity of the Secretary of the Treasury or the Comptroller, you should fix by law a rule of common sense and under it get interest on such of the people's money as is being used by rich capitalists.

You all remember that a long time ago old Judge Coke said equity was an uncertainty; that it depended upon the length of the boot or shoe of the chancellor, because depending on his discretion in each case was no better. So this principle of selecting United States depositories is so uncertain that it might as well depend upon the boot of the officer or the shoe of the officer who is to select the depository. It is a system of absolute favoritism, or at any rate there is nothing in the written law to prevent its becoming such a system.

A system of absolute favoritism. Now, I do not mean to say that it is always absolute favoritism in practice, because I am free to admit that there has been generally a considerable degree of fairness—more than was perhaps ordinarily to be expected; but I do mean to say that the power is theirs to select friends and to put the money into the banks of friends without a cent of interest.

Now, why not let those banks have the money which have first—first, mind you—deposited self-sufficing and absolutely self-sufficing and independent security for the repayment of the principal—so that no matter whether the bank continues in business or fails, the principal will be certainly repaid to the United States Government; and then with the different banks bidding upon that sort of prerequisite proposition, with that sort of security deposited beforehand, give it to those banks, under certain limitations of amounts, which bid the highest rate of interest. What would be the advantage of that? Why, the advantage would be, instead of the money going to the great congested money centers to be lent to speculators for booming "industrials" or exploiting

wind-swollen swindling "trusts," or for "bearing" and "bulling" agricultural produce "on 'change," it would go to the parts of the country that need money most and could therefore afford to pay the highest rate of interest for it.

I have not a doubt that you could get from 2 to 3 per cent on call for every dollar that is lying in the Treasury with banks that would deposit as security outside of their capital stock, outside of their credit as banks, ample collateral to secure it beyond all peradventure of a doubt. Are you going to "stand pat" on that, too? Are you going to continue forever to lend the people's money to the banks of the country with no rate of interest at all? By the way, what is there, Democratic or Republican, in the idea that the only banks that can borrow money free from the Government of the United States, if any are to be helped for nothing in that way; or if you change it and make it more just and right and charge them interest; what is there Democratic, or Republican, or American, or fair, in restricting the individuals so favored to the class of national banks? It would seem that anybody who gives equal interest ought to have an equal chance for security or for a loan. Are you going to "stand pat" on lending millionaires millions without interest?

Now, my friends, another subject. Are you going to stand pat on the trusts? Why, it begins to look like you were. There is not anything I can find in the President's message in any way about the trusts except he says that "publicity" will cure it all. Now I appeal to my friend—a fairer-minded man never existed—I appeal to my friend from Connecticut, and other people of that sort, do you believe that allowing a corporation to fix up its assets and liabilities and make a public statement of them will particularly hurt a dishonest corporation?

Will it not, on the contrary, frequently give them the advantage of seeming to have the fiat of public approval?

Did you ever know a national bank to fail that had not published shortly before a magnificent statement, and the statement had been indorsed and approved by its officers and some bank examiner? Publicity is all right—we ought to have it. Light is always good; light does more to prevent crime than policemen do in all the cities in this country; but to rely upon it solely to prevent the enormous extortion of these trusts, to prevent what is worse than extortion, regular public swindles organized under the laws of New Jersey, or some other State, for the purpose of taking in the "unco' guid," the unwary and innocent people, the "lamb," publishing immense prospectuses that they have two millions or two billions of capital, when they have not thirty thousand dollars in their vaults, when they have not cash enough to furnish operating expenses for a year, as was the case with the "shipping trust," are you going to do nothing about that? Are you going to "stand pat" on that?

Now, I have introduced a bill. The bill is not perfect, and since introducing it I would like to amend it in several particulars; but the idea of the bill is this, to punish public swindling and public cheats engaged in interstate commerce, for if the immense overcapitalization, enabling lying prospectuses, amounts to a swindle to the people to whom they sell stock, then it is a swindle upon the people generally all over this country. Gentlemen may say that it would only protect stockholders, but I tell you this Government, armed with the power to regulate interstate commerce, ought to protect even the stockholders from these miserable exploiters of Wall street or elsewhere, who make up these combinations, who float bonds and securities freely at the expense of the public upon a public lie. Are you going to "stand pat" on that? Are you going to "stand pat" again against all the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission? On December 15, 1903, I introduced a bill (H. R. 7640) to accomplish an other recommendation of that Commission, and this seems to me reasonable enough. Now, I want the country to know whether you are going to "stand pat" against it or some legislation calculated to accomplish the same end.

Here is the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person, firm, or corporation, or association of individuals, or association of corporations engaged in interstate commerce shall make it a condition of the sale of goods, wares, or merchandise that the purchaser shall not sell or deal in the goods, wares, or merchandise of any other person, firm, corporation, or association of natural or artificial persons: *Provided,* That this act shall not be construed to prohibit the appointment of agents or sole agents for the sale of goods, wares, or merchandise (Massachusetts Statutes, June 7, 1901). Any violation of the provision of this act shall be held to be a contract in restraint of trade among the several States under the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; and every person who shall be a party to said contract in violation of this act shall, on conviction thereof, be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court, and shall be subject to such other penalties, forfeitures, and suits in equity and actions at law as are prescribed in sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 of an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890.

The bill is simply to forbid and to penalize a favorite system of the trusts of refusing to sell to a person, firm, or corporation, un-

less the former will promise and stand bound not to deal in like goods sold by anyone other than the trust, or not to sell to certain person obnoxious to the trust as competitors of theirs. The bill simply forbids trusts to use an industrial bludgeon to kill competitors. Are you going to "stand pat" against this measure or something like it, and thereby "stand pat" in favor of a continuance of the interstate commercial method now pursued by the sugar trust, Standard Oil trust, and steel trust?

This bill, introduced by me after consultation on this side, is almost literally a copy of a Massachusetts statute, and therefore has a Republican origin. Dare you deny the justice, equity, or necessity underlying it? What a poor card to "stand pat" on is the evil it strikes at? Here is another bill, introduced after much consultation with colleagues on this side. Let me read it:

A bill to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix transportation rates in certain contingencies.

Be it enacted, etc., That when, hereafter, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall declare a given rate for transportation of freight or passengers unreasonable, it shall be the duty of the Commission, and it is hereby authorized to perform that duty, to declare at the same time what would be a reasonable rate in lieu of the rate declared unreasonable.

SEC. 2. That whenever, in consequence of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a rate has been established and declared as reasonable and litigation shall ensue because of such decision, the rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission shall continue as the rate to be charged by the transportation company during the pendency of the litigation and until the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be held to be error on a final judgment of the questions involved by the United States court having proper jurisdiction.

That is H. R. 6768, introduced December 10, 1903.

It merely asks that the present absurd condition of things in connection with the Interstate Commerce Commission be done away with. I refer to this condition: The Interstate Commerce Commission has power to declare a given rate, when the question concerning what it ought to be is before the Commission, to be unreasonable, and to forbid the railroads from collecting that rate. Say it is 50 cents; the railroad changes it to 49 cents. The Commission declares 49 cents unreasonable, and the railroad changes it to 48 cents. Each time the shipper, or a new shipper, must lodge a new complaint, and so on, if the railroad chooses, *ad infinitum*.

There stands that Interstate Commerce Commission, acting under a law so puerile and childish that the Commission has the power to declare a given rate or charge unreasonable, but is without any legal power to declare what rate would, in its stead, be reasonable. That is not all; as a consequence of the puerility of the law when the Commission declares 50 cents unreasonable, let us say, then the railroad can immediately have it reviewed in another court; or otherwise, they instigate litigation and motions, demurrers, bills, cross-bills, etc., go on and on and on, and in the interim the railroad is benefited by being permitted to continue charging the rate declared unreasonable; the railroad receives the benefit of the doubt of what the final judgment may be, and not this tribunal erected by this great Government. The shipper must pay in *pendente lite* to the railroad, paying what the Interstate Commerce Commission has denounced as unreasonable.

We propose upon this side to say this: That whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission pronounces a given rate unreasonable they shall have then and there the power to fix in its stead a reasonable rate, and this rate shall be operative until on final judgments by proper proceedings in the proper Federal court the finding of the Commission shall be overruled. It is not arming them with the power to make an omnibus schedule all over the country, but wherever, on question raised by complaint or otherwise, they declare a given rate to be unreasonable, they shall then have the power to state what is a reasonable rate; and furthermore, that that rate shall be operative until it is set aside by due process of law. That is all. I do not think myself that any small body of men could arrange, or ought to be empowered to arrange, an omnibus schedule for so vast a country with such divergent sectional interests as ours. Are you going to stand pat against this plainly just demand of the Interstate Commerce Commission, too?

My friend, Mr. ADAMSON, of Georgia, the senior Democratic member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has introduced a bill simply embodying all the recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That and nothing else. You need not adopt all of them, but some of them surely are worthy of adoption; some of them ought to be indorsed. Will you "stand pat" against all of them?

Now, I see before me a man—the sledge hammer of the Republican party, a man of weight in every way, a man in my opinion of justice, Mr. HEPBURN of Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I do not believe that he is going to allow his committee to be held back by purely partisan considerations, with the idea of "standing pat," without doing some of the things that the Interstate Commerce Commission recommend.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see what you are going to "stand pat"

on. Are you going to stand pat upon the Executive investigation of the admitted rottenness in the Post-Office Department? Are you going to abdicate your functions as a Congress to supervise and correct and check and clean the Executive Departments, and see that their work is honestly carried on? Now, do not misunderstand me. I shall never be the sewer of any anonymous charges, or quasi-anonymous charges, or confidential charges against the character and good name of any man. I do not believe that Republicans as a class are any more dishonest than Democrats. But I do believe this, that when a party has been in power as long as has been the Republican party, then, unless it is awfully particular and careful, and goes beyond expected lines even in punishing corruption and rottenness in its ranks, the natural judgment of mankind will be that its members have been in so long, and are so coherent in illegalities that they can not reform themselves. Are you going to leave the question of punishing post-office thieves and robbers to their friends as well as the revision of the tariff to its friends? [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The other day I was talking to one of my friends over there on that side, and he said, "John, aren't you afraid if they get to looking into that thing too closely they will hit somebody on your own side?" I said, "If they look into it deep enough, and they find a man on my side that ought to be hit, I hope they will do it, and when they do, I will not wait for you to lead the attack. I will lead the charge, and when we have pitched him out of the windows of this body, metaphorically, we will have broken every miserable political bone he has in his body." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I do not charge you with trying to cover up this thing, but I do charge you with lack of sufficient "energy." You seem to be threatened with premonitory symptoms of investigation paresis. Why was it otherwise that you voted down the other day the resolution introduced by the gentlemen from Virginia [Mr. HAY] to investigate Bristow's charge that unnamed members of Congress had been *particeps criminis* in fraud and bribery; sending it to the Post-Office Committee instead of voting it up and having a committee specially appointed by the Chair?

Mr. HAY's resolution called for a special committee to be appointed by your own Speaker.

There is not a man in this House on either side of it that does not know—and I appeal to those on this side of the House—that if the Speaker of this House appointed a committee of that sort it would be an honest committee and it would be appointed to get at the truth. Are you afraid to get at the truth? [Applause.] It would be appointed for that express purpose. Why, gentlemen, if there had been a single corrupt bone in the Speaker's body he would have been worth two millions to-day. [Applause.] Now, why is it that you did not let your own Speaker appoint a special committee to investigate this matter?

Don't you know as well as you know your names that, no matter how honestly the men at the head of an investigation in the Post-Office Department may strive to make that investigation full and complete, the whole Department must necessarily be honeycombed with personal friendships that restrain men, and keep men of good, or perhaps I ought to say soft, hearts from pushing and thrusting where they ought to push and thrust: and don't you know that it can not do any harm to let this House go to the very bottom of every bit of it? If there be anything that has not been discovered thus far, drag it up by its drowned locks.

Why, your President tells you that the land business is just as rotten as the Post-Office. He tells you so in his message. Why not have that specially or otherwise investigated by this House? We are charged with legislation. How can we legislate until we know how much of the public money is stolen and how much of it is honestly expended? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Are you going to stand pat on that?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And also the Indian Territory affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, my friend suggests something about the Dawes Commission in the Indian Territory. That has been probed to a little extent, but seemingly the surgeons thought it cruel to probe further; but let us probe it all, and do not let us probe it from a partisan standpoint. Such is my confidence in the Speaker that I would be willing to let him appoint a committee of five Republicans, provided all the other Republicans in the United States let him alone and let him appoint them on his own hook and on his own say so. [Applause and laughter.] Let us have it.

Lo and behold, my friends, there is one other thing that I had almost forgotten! You are so fond of class legislation that when you can not build up particular class interests at the general expense in an indirect way by giving them what you call "protection," which by the way is not much protection to the balance of the people, but a burden to them, then you want to vote money directly out of the Treasury to build them up. Thus by bounty your Peek-a-Boo has proposed to hothouse the shipbuilding class.

Now I want to know what you mean on this ship subsidy question. The country wants to know. I am "a chiel asking questions;" that is all. Do you mean merely to tide this thing over until after the election, and then bring in something like the Hanna subsidy bill, because you are afraid to indorse it before election? Is that what you mean? Do you really want to build up the American merchant marine? I do. Do you really want to build it up without making its prosperity a burden on the balance of the country? I do.

Why, the old Democratic party has blazed a way in the past and put upon the statute books the only legislation that ever successfully built up an American merchant marine, and we propose to build it up as Jefferson and Madison did, not by burdening the people with taxation, but by relieving the people from taxation. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING] has filed, as I am informed, in this House a minority report to the bill which relegates the entire ship subsidy question to a commission, in which he recommends that instead of waiting we proceed now, and in which he says that the commission fixed by the Constitution to deal with this question is a committee in this House and a committee in the other House. He says that we have enough government by commission, or rather enough of nongovernment by commission. The few reports commissions have made were laughed at or voted down by the House and the Senate.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] will remember the commission of 1883. He will remember how they labored and how they brought in after a while a recommendation of a bill, and he will remember with what absolute ridicule it met, and remember also that afterwards the bill that was passed—the tariff bill of 1883—was a bill virtually originated in the Senate and indorsed by the House, and not the bill recommended by the commission. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LUCKING], I say, has brought in a report citing the ineffectiveness of these commissions, asking Congress not to abdicate its functions, asking us not to wait until "after election," but to proceed *now* to build up the American merchant marine, and he has suggested the plan which was tried early in the history of the country, and which succeeded, namely, the plan of giving to goods imported in American bottoms a reduction upon the import duty.

How long do you think it would take to build up an American merchant marine if each article of goods that was shipped into the harbors of New York, Boston, Baltimore, New Orleans, etc., and sent in foreign bottoms, had to pay 20 per cent more duty than if shipped in an American bottom, if the very fact of its being shipped in an American bottom would give an advantage to the consignee of 20 per cent reduction of the duty? As to conflicting treaties, every one contains the right expressly reserved on behalf of each government to abrogate on due notice, and the act should contain the required notice. While that doctrine is democratic it is not unrepudiated. You will remember that in 1896, when you nominated Mr. McKinley, in your platform you then advocated building up an American merchant marine by "discriminating import duties."

Ah, but perhaps you meant by "discrimination of duties" to burden the people yet further by taxation; that is to say, to raise the import duties upon goods imported in foreign bottoms 20 per cent above present rates, instead of doing as we want to do, relieving the consumer from taxation and building up a merchant marine, at one and the same time, by making the discrimination fall on the other side of the line—namely, by *reducing* import duties on goods imported in American bottoms 20 per cent from the present rates.

Now, I do not mean 20 per cent absolutely. I do not know what percentage would be right. I named 20 per cent merely because that is the limit to which you could go under the Dingley bill. Perhaps 10 per cent might be sufficient. The old discriminating duty was 10 per cent, and it was found sufficient. We Democrats do not, like Senators HANNA and FRYE, recommend an experiment. Our plan has been tried, its success never denied, and we are ready to try it again.

Why not, then, go ahead right now before your committee; investigate now; have hearings to find out just what percentage of tariff reduction would make up the difference between the pay of labor employed upon American ships and the pay of labor on foreign ships. Send subcommittees to other points, if needful. Let us progress! Go forward! Build up! Don't let everything, even your eternal salvation, wait "until after the election."

I want to say one thing more, Mr. Chairman, in this connection. I would not go even so far as I do in favoring legislation to build up a special industry but for one fact; our legislation here in Congress has been such as to make labor employed on American ships necessarily cost more as compared with the labor on foreign ships; and therefore, if we could make up for this legislation by enabling the shipbuilder to get back the amount we have virtually taxed him by our laws and our regulation con-

cerning American-built ships, and in that way not only benefit him but benefit the American people, the general consumers, by relieving them somewhat of taxation, I am willing to do it.

At the same time we would not be doing anything which the Dingley bill itself does not concede can be done, even from a Republican and protectionist standpoint, and still leave duties high enough. I am not willing that any special industry shall be built up by taxing all the people, but I am willing that it may be done by *untaxing* some or all the people. Do you want to "stand pat," or do you want to do something else? Oh, my friends on the other side, do you know what you are getting to be? You are getting to be the party of negation and obstruction to progress in this country; you are getting to be the party of standstillism; you are standing in the way of every reform. You have become, by long use and abuse of power, ultra conservative—ultra "stand pat."

By the way, Governor Cummins says a very good thing. He says "these people talk about letting well enough alone, as if anything ever was well enough." Who ever heard of anything in the political or industrial world being "well enough?" Who hopes to see things "well enough" until we enter into that final state of bliss which all good Democrats expect to enjoy? [Laughter.]

Oh, my friends, whenever we ask you to do anything, you respond, as my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], did the other day, by prating about prosperity.

Why, my friend CHAMP CLARK of Missouri, I am informed, though he never told me so himself, was making a speech down in Missouri one day in a Republican section of that otherwise good Democratic State, and he delineated the horrors of war carried on against a defenseless people guilty only of first trusting us and afterwards loving their native land and wanting to be free and independent; he delineated the horrors of colonialism, and he showed how the very birth principle of the Republic had been opposition to colonialism, and how we were now going into "the George III business" ourselves. He dwelt upon the desolated fields and the ruined harvests in the Philippines. He said that if immediately after the war of the Revolution the French had turned around and made war upon us, and denied that we had ever had an alliance with them, about the only difference would have been that we had a paper alliance with France, and we never had had a paper alliance with the Filipinos, but that we did fight side by side with them and shoot side by side with them. He went into all the horrors of colonialism and the dangers of it as retroactive on our institutions and our morals, discussing it as a great moral question; and then he said finally, "Fellow-citizens, can you stand for that?" And you know when CHAMP said it, it was heard everywhere; and he said it well. But one fellow said, "Well, I reckon we kin as long as steers is worth 6 cents a pound in Missouri." [Laughter.]

That is just about the moral and mental measure of average Republicanism. Why, we used to think that it was so funny we never could persuade the ordinary plantation dandy that prosperity did not depend entirely upon government, or persuade him out of the idea that he would get more money for his cotton provided the Republican ticket won, as the carpet baggers told him he would; but we never dreamed that we had to meet that sort of an argument before white people. [Laughter.]

We never dreamed that any man alive, who would count up the sum total of human happiness and human prosperity, and give due credit to ancestry, and give due credit to environment, due credit to soil, due credit to climate, due credit to sunshine and rain, due credit to frugality, self-control, and perseverance, and due credit to the constant foresight of God and His prescience from the beginning when He built it all, would then tell us that all the policies of a great government ought to depend upon the price of beef in Missouri! [Laughter.] The price of beef! A thing that we are exporting every day; that we are selling abroad, dressed and raw and on foot, and in every other form; that nobody outside of a lunatic asylum ever pretended could be helped in price by a tariff, if the duty on beef was 17,000 per cent.

Now, my Republican friends, mark the day! The Populists just before you, and you now, have taught the American people that industrial and farm prosperity depend upon Washington. You absolutely went before all these people and taught them that a world's panic, that existed in Australia and the Argentine and Austria and England, was due to four lines upon the American statute books, some of you; and some of the balance of you said it was due to the anticipation of the Gorman-Wilson bill. You have taught the people that way. It is harder to unteach a man than it is to teach him. Ah, this world goes on like the tide, coming in, up a little, back a little, up a little farther, back a little, until it reaches the height of the tide, and then the ebb sets in; and we three hundred and eighty-odd politicians here can not stop the course of nature and the operation of God's laws.

When men are in a state of prosperity they become careless about debt. They are willing to borrow, and they are willing to go into new ventures, and they do it recklessly and carelessly. Some day somebody wants to collect, and they begin to collect all along the line, everybody crying "Cash," bubbles burst and then business drops to the bed-rock bottom, when nothing answers but "cash," when property itself has to be sold under the hammer at half its value; and then, when things get down to the true basis again, people begin to gather courage, they begin to do business upon a sound basis, because they have not the credit to do it on any other basis, and then, more confidence coming, they run in debt just a little carelessly, then a little more, then a great deal, despising as an old fogey him who won't run in debt, and then again the ominous cry "Cash," and then all over again.

Some of your bubbles have burst already; and when they shall have all burst, my friends, then the poisoned chalice will return. It will be commended to your own lips. The very lessons you have taught will come back to scourge you. You might get up on every stump in this country and try to preach common sense, but the fools you have misled will say, "You are the very fellows that taught us that, taught us what you say now is not common sense." Oh! that day of reckoning and wrath! How will you avoid it? Retrench your extravagance. Punish your corruptionists. Revise your bad laws. Put the people's house in order; otherwise—

*Dies frae, dies illa,
Solvat saeculum in favilla.*

I say some of your bubbles have begun to burst. I need not call attention to them. I need not take up the time. I am too tired to do it anyhow. Start with the shipping trust. Follow them out yourselves. I want to talk of something else. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] asked the other day if any of us could point out a day when wages were higher, when this country was in a better condition. I said yes, and at haphazard I said, "This day one year ago." Now, without tiring myself further, I will read a few things from a very reputable and non-political journal, *The American Wool and Cotton Reporter*. These are all in one number of the paper, December 10, about the time of the answer and question.

MILL NOTES.

The Berkshire Mills, at Adams, Mass., have followed the lead of the other cotton manufacturers and posted notices that on December 14 there would be a 10 per cent reduction in wages. The matter is being taken very quietly by the help, as in spite of the idea expressed some time ago that, owing to the better class of goods made there and higher class of help employed, there would be no reduction, yet it was generally thought that such a cut would take place. About 2,400 employees will be affected by the reduction. Notices of reductions of 10 per cent in wages were also posted at the Eclipse and Beaver mills, at North Adams, owned by Gallup & Houghton, and at the Greylock Mills. The reduction will take effect the 14th.

The New Bedford Loom Fixers' Union held a meeting on Wednesday evening of last week, when the report of the delegates to the recent conference with the manufacturers was made. There was a heated discussion on the report, with the result that the following vote was recorded:

"Voted: That the Loom Fixers' Union accept the cutdown in wages under protest, believing, as we do, that it is no remedy for the depression in trade." James Bamford was chosen to represent the union at the banquet which was given by the New Bedford textile council to William Mullen on Saturday evening, at which the full executive board was present.

At the Pondicherry woolen mills, Bridgeton, Me., the management has only twenty looms running.

Practically all the striking weavers have returned to their work in the O. & E. Morrison woolen mills at Tilton, N. H. A new overseer from Lowell is in charge of the room and the management is arranging to put two new fixers at work. No further trouble is anticipated. The strike was the result of a change in the wage schedule.

The Shove mills, of Fall River, began on Wednesday to operate only three days a week for an indefinite period. The mill employs 750 hands.

The mill of the Parsons Manufacturing Company, Cohoes, N. Y., went on forty hours a week recently. The hours are from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m., working five days a week.

The woolen mill at Ashaway, R. I., has been shut down, it is stated, for an indefinite period. The woolen-yarn mill at Wyoming, owned by Kenyon & Woodbury, has been shut down during the past week, and just when it will start up is not stated. It is claimed, however, that operation will be begun again within a few days, or as soon as the Carolina Company get to going full capacity on the new goods. This mill makes yarn to a large extent for the Carolina Company. The shoddy mill at Barberville, in Hopkinton, which is also owned by Kenyon & Woodbury, has been idle for a week or two, although until recently it has been pushed to its full capacity.

The Jefferson Manufacturing Company, at Worcester, Mass., has ordered both of its woolen mills in Jefferson shut down for an indefinite period. During the idle period the machinery will be repaired.

For the past fortnight or more business has been quiet at Westerly, R. I. Both the mills of the Westerly Woolen Company and the company's mills on the West-Side have been closed for over a week. Orders have not been plentiful, and the prospects are that little will be done by the company this winter, as it is reported that when the order the company is engaged on has been filled business will be suspended till further notice.

The Golden Rod woolen mills, Wales, Mass., are running about two-thirds of the machinery on a schedule of eight hours per day, and are getting out samples with hopes of running full very shortly.

Attorney Charles G. Irish, as temporary receiver of the Otter Knitting Company, at Utica, N. Y., has disposed of the machinery, office fixtures, and manufactured stock at auction. The whole amount brought by the sale was \$1,250.

The textile workers of Uxbridge, Mass., are feeling the effects of the dull period in the woolen manufacturing industry severely. The Calumet and Hecla mills of the Calumet Woolen Company are shut down and 500 employees are idle. It is not known when these plants will be reopened.

The Stearns woolen mill at West Rutland, Mass., owned by the Lakeville

Co., is shut down. Deputy Sheriff James Early, of Worcester, having placed an attachment on the property in behalf of S. Rawitser & Co., of New York. A keeper is in charge. The suit is an action of contract to recover for stock furnished the company. About 200 hands are idle.

A change in the wage schedule of the woolen mills of O. & E. Morrison at Tilton, N. H., is being resisted by the weavers, 40 of whom are on strike. The mills are shut down, and in all nearly 200 operatives are idle. A notice was posted by the management giving a new schedule of wages for weaving. Some of the grades of cloth were cut a quarter of a cent per yard, and a few grades of cloth were raised half a cent per yard. At the same time the management reduced its force of loom fixers. The overseer was dissatisfied at having his fixing force cut down and quit work. When he went out the entire force of weavers followed. When the weavers struck most of the hands in the mill had to go out also.

Now, remember these I am reading are all in one paper published on one day. Then here is an item telling where in Fall River they have a great call in response to some North Carolina manufacturing association, and an appeal is made to curtail production or to reduce wages or do something because New England is suffering.

In response to a call of a committee representing the North Carolina Manufacturing Association, more than 100 Southern cotton manufacturers, representing 244,392 spindles and 8,065 looms, met at Charlotte, N. C., on Tuesday and started a plan for curtailing production by the mills of the entire country, a more detailed account of which is given elsewhere. The plan proposed by the conference would probably result in a better understanding between the two sections, even if it did not result in any positive agreement as to curtailment.

Now, this proposed "plan" is either not "straight" or else these people are not as "flush" as the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have us believe.

Mr. PALMER. Does the high price of cotton, 15 cents a pound, have anything to do with these reductions and shut-downs?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It should not have had, because manufacturers have raised the price of cotton goods correspondingly, and furthermore I do not know anywhere in the world that anybody has got cotton goods enough. [Laughter.] In addition I would add in answer to the gentleman's question, that most of the reductions, lockouts and shut-downs I have read from this textile trade journal of December 10 are in connection with the woolen industry, and 15-cent cotton could have nothing to do with them. Let me here read something I cut from the *Washington Post*:

STEEL WORKERS PROTEST—IN FACE OF WAGE REDUCTION 40,000 MEN RESUME WORK.

PITTSBURG, PA., Jan. 5.—Following closely upon the alleged dissatisfaction of the 500 employees of the 40-inch mill at the Homestead Steel Works of the Carnegie Steel Company, who are objecting to the reduction in their wages made by the company, the 400 men employed on the 48-inch mill are also protesting. Last night a secret meeting was held, at which a compromise scale was formulated, and this was submitted to the company to-day. The men considered that the cut announced is too great, and, it is said, they are willing to accept a reduction, but not such a large one. A strike is not expected.

During the past two weeks over 40,000 wage-earners, who have been idle for months, have been furnished employment by the resumption of mills in the Pittsburgh district.

It is said that the demand for iron and steel products is increasing, and contracts are being let more freely than at any time during the depression, which covers a period of nearly four months.

This concerns Pennsylvania. What has 15-cent cotton to do with that? Is this reduction "straight" in view of the last paragraph of the clipping? Or if that last paragraph expresses the truth then why, under Republican legislative conditions, is it that this great trust, while "flush" itself, can not deal a flush hand to its employees?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I got hold of the first of these papers I could soon after the gentleman from Iowa had asked his question, and this many reductions, lockouts, etc., I found in one number.

Mr. Chairman, I can not speak any longer, but I have here in my hands a list of wage reductions, wage restrictions, and shut downs. Here they are—newspaper clippings making this great package, and a list in this small one. These in this bundle are for less than three months from September 21 to December 7, 1903. I ask unanimous consent to insert such of them as I wish in the RECORD, as an appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of certain matters to which he has referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course no partisan can be fair altogether. That goes without saying. But I do try to be fair, even on a partisan question. No man raised as I have been raised, with my environments, my heredity, with my opinions, can see things altogether without some color in his spectacles, of course. But I want to appeal to you and beg of you—I want to appeal to the country to see to it that we have not sunk this great Republic to a state of impotency where a party can win an election upon a confession that it either dares not or will not go forward—upon a confession that things are "well enough" in this poor world of ours. It is announced all over this country that your idea is to pass the ordinary appropriation bills, get rid of such local bills as come in by unanimous consent, and then adjourn the Congress, and leave all things to be attended to later on "by their friends."

Well, if they are right things, and if you are their friends, why do you not attend to them now? [Applause.] Do you want to absolutely force the country to force you out so that we can come in? If you can not ride this horse, get off the saddle. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We can ride him [laughter on the Republican side], and we will ride him right, too. If we don't, the country can find somebody who can ride. Oh, I understand that when a party comes in after another party has had a long lease of power that some of the bronchos necessarily must buck a little. [Laughter.] I understand that you can not reverse an engine without shaking up a few of the passengers a little bit; some of the passengers you will especially shake up—that class that I love to call "The Grand Association of Tariff Barons and Tariff Beggars."

The fellows who at one moment will crawl upon their stomachs to the Committee on Ways and Means, begging like paupers to be supported, because, by their own confession, they can not support themselves without the aid of the law; and then, at the next moment, after they have gotten all they beg for, "stand pat" and spend about all the money there is in the United States, and put on about all the airs that are put on in the United States, and then go out and tell us that we are such a "great industrial people" that they are "selling all sorts of manufactured goods to all parts of the world." [Applause on Democratic side.]

These are the people who sell cheaper abroad than at home. These are the people to whom an extortionate tariff schedule is a legislative shelter to perpetrate extortion on the home consumer and to make it of so much importance to railroads that the latter grant them 33½ per cent rebates on goods shipped for export, recouping in freight rates on State and interstate commerce.

Now, my friends, the New England boot and shoe people came here a while back, crawled upon their stomachs, and said, "Can you not—will you not—give us some help?" "O, father, grandfather, mammy, grandaunt," or whatever the Government is, in their opinion, "help us to stand alone;" and now they tell us they are shipping to all the world. But I will venture to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Connecticut, if there were a hearing to-morrow and there was a proposition to reduce the duties on boots and shoes 50 per cent, while reducing the duty on hides 50 or 75 per cent, or wiping it out, they would go back to their old attitude and get on their stomachs, with their tongues hanging out, licking up the dust, asking for the duty because they could not "stand alone."

They tell us at one moment they are meeting the pauper labor of the world in all the markets of the world after paying the freight, and then they tell us the next moment that if we do not stand right up under them and hold them up above the ground, out of reach, the pauper labor will get them and "eat them up," as the children say when telling Red Riding Hood stories about "old wolves."

Mr. Chairman, I shall insert as an appendix the reductions, lockouts, etc., in answer to challenge of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. I thank both sides of the House for their courtesy and considerate attention. [Prolonged applause.]

APPENDIX.

[Boston Transcript, August 17, 1903.]

COKE OVENS BLOWING OUT—CONNELLVILLE REGION OPERATORS CURTAILING ON ACCOUNT OF OVERSUPPLY—BELIEF THAT DULLNESS IS BUT TEMPORARY.

PITTSBURG, PA., August 17, 1903.

Closely following the shut-down of the many iron and steel plants in the Pittsburgh and valley districts, there has come as a natural sequence a slump in the coke market. During the past week the tonnage of this fuel took a drop of nearly 10,000 tons, and the indications are that it will go much lower in the next few days. The furnaces are overstocked at the ruling prices and there is no spot coke on the market, unless it is offered at very low prices. The shipments dropped off 2,000 cars. Almost 30,000 tons of the coke produced was thrown on the yards. Following the lack of demand came an order to blow out the ovens, and over 400 ovens were closed down last week, and it is a strong probability that by Wednesday or Thursday a number more will be on the waiting list.

Nearly one-half of the active ovens in the Connellsville region were limited to a five-day run. The general supposition is that a car famine is on, but such is not the case, according to the operators. There are plenty of cars in the coke trade to-day, and there is no freight congestion which indicates to the coke men that there is an overproduction of coke, and the blowing out process naturally had to follow. How long this condition will last is hard to foretell.

The summary of the Connellsville region for the week ending Saturday, August 8, shows 22,191 ovens in the region with 20,850 ovens in blast and 1,341 ovens idle. The slump in the demand for coke caused 380 ovens to blow out, and about 300 more will go out this week. In addition to the ovens blown out the five-day operations were increased last week from 3,906 to 9,379 ovens, almost half the entire active ovens of the region. The production of the region in tons for the week estimated upon the ovens drawn amounted to 228,131 tons, as compared to 239,673 tons for the week previous, a decrease of 11,542 tons. The shipments of coke for the week amounted to 8,948 cars, as compared to 10,974 cars the week previous, a decrease of 2,026 cars.

The shipments in tons, estimated upon reports received from shipping points, amounted to 200,550 tons, as compared to 242,928 tons the week previous, a decrease of 42,378 tons. The United States Steel Corporation furnaces have plenty of coke, with big stocks in the yards, and the output has been curtailed so far as they are concerned. The large and small independent operators also feel the slump and are blowing out ovens, except those small firms that have contracts on which they are running.

Withal, the operators are not looking at the situation in a gloomy manner. They appear to understand the causes leading to the dull condition of the trade, and feel that in a few weeks, at the least, an upward move will come and the Connellsville region coke ovens will be as busy as ever.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, August 17, 1903.]

WOOLEN MILLS TO CLOSE—AMERICAN COMPANY'S PLANTS TO SUSPEND FOR TWO WEEKS.

BURLINGTON, VT., August 16, 1903.

The Burlington, Winooski, and Colchester mills, of the American Woolen Company, will not resume operations to-morrow, orders having been received for a two-weeks' suspension. In addition to the Washington Mills at Lawrence, Mass., and the Assabet Mills, at Maynard, Mass., the company has also decided to close the Lebanon and Mascoma mills and Baltic Mills, of Enfield, in the Mascoma Valley, New Hampshire, for a similar period. These mills employ a total of about 10,000 hands.

The shutdown, the company announces, is for the purpose of giving the employees a vacation and to admit of repairs and improvements at several plants.

[From the Philadelphia North American, August 30, 1903.]

BROTHERHOOD OF BOILERMAKERS AGREES TO REDUCE WAGES FOR COUNTRY'S SAKE—MEMBERS OF FIVE LODGES IN BALTIMORE ARE WILLING TO TAKE LESS WAGES FOR OVERTIME WORK, AND THEREBY HOPE TO HELP IN REESTABLISHING THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE.

BALTIMORE, August 29, 1903.

In refutation of the often-made charge that labor unions are ever unreasonable, members of the Brotherhood of Boilermakers, of this city, point to the agreement just entered into with their employers, who form the Ship and Marine Builders Employers' Association, whereby the men have voluntarily reduced their wages. The men will now work overtime for one and one-half their regular wages, whereas they were formerly getting two and three-quarters.

The action was taken on the representation of the Employers' Association that it would be impossible for them to compete with out-of-the-city firms if the existing rate for overtime was exacted this year. Overtime work is a very large item in marine work. A damaged vessel must get away from the dry dock as soon as possible after entering, for delays are expensive. The commanders would rather pay overtime charges than lay over the time represented by such work. The new agreement is to remain in force one year, with sixty days' notice by either side if a change is to be demanded.

Another important feature of this agreement is that the men declare that under no circumstances will they enter upon a sympathetic strike during the term of the contract. Any disagreement is to be arbitrated by a committee of the men and the proprietors of the shop in which said disagreement arises. The local Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Ship Builders comprises about 1,900 men, belonging to five lodges. All the leading firms in the city, eleven in all, have now signed the modified contracts, and it would seem that at last peace in this particular trade is assured.

Of the agreement and the action of the men in reducing their own wages, President Thomas Basshor, of the Employers' Association, said:

"I believe the men will live up to their agreement to the letter, and that their action will have a most excellent effect on all lines of business that employ union labor."

Donald Crawford, president of the union, said:

"Meeting employers halfway is a great improvement over the old methods of seeking to force them to meet your demands. It is more to the interest of the men to so meet them than it is to fight them. Fights are expensive and good feeling on both sides is invaluable. Our concessions are in line with those being made throughout the country by our brotherhood. We have agreed to take less wages than we could probably have secured by putting up a fight, in the hope that it will do some good in reestablishing the merchant marine, which is showing a decrease in this country."

The effort of George Cavanaugh, general organizer for the Amalgamated Carpenters, to reorganize the carpenters of Baltimore can not be said to be a very great success. Thus far he has succeeded in getting but 32 of the men to leave their old unions and enter the new one. Mr. Cavanaugh says that he will return here shortly and resume his efforts, but the men do not believe he will make any further attempt to reorganize them at present.

A careful canvass of the newspaper writers of Baltimore does not bring out the slightest enthusiasm for the union proposed by the International Typographical Union at its recent session in Washington, and for which \$1,000 was set aside. The reporters and editors almost to a man declare that such a union is impossible where ingenuity enters so largely into the value of a man's services to a newspaper. As well might inventors, they claim, join a union.

James Gallagher and Peter Harron, of Baltimore, are required by an order just signed by Judge Morris, of the United States circuit court, to show cause by September 18 why they should not be attached for contempt of court in not obeying the injunction issued to restrain the former employees of the Henry McShane Company from in any manner interfering with the new employees. The two defendants are charged with having sought by threats and intimidation to make the nonunion men employed in place of the men who struck join the union. They are also charged with having led a mob that badly thrashed two of the nonunion men.

All arrangements are now complete for the great Baltimore Labor Day demonstration. The managers declare that it will be the greatest ever witnessed in the State. Besides the great parade, there will be four monster picnics, at which all the good things of Chesapeake Bay will be served as they only can be in Maryland.

[From the Boston Transcript, September 16, 1903.]

TO CURTAIL COAL OUTPUT—PENNSYLVANIA COMPANIES MAY DECIDE—MINERS MAY BE PUT ON FOUR DAYS A WEEK—INDEPENDENT OPERATORS CUTTING PRICES—REDUCTION OF 40 CENTS A TON SAID TO HAVE BEEN MADE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., September 16, 1903.

Officials of the Reading and Pennsylvania railroads say no step has yet been taken toward a curtailment of the output of anthracite coal and that the matter has not even been considered.

It was admitted, however, by an official of one of the companies that some curtailment would have to be made soon. He added that he would not be surprised if the miners were put on four days a week in a short time.

Meanwhile independent operators, without any storage facilities for their surplus output, are said to be cutting the circular prices for the domestic sizes as much as 40 cents per ton, offering the coal for \$3.35 at the mines, as against circular price of \$3.75.

A general cut of 25 cents in the price of pea coal was made yesterday.

[From the Boston Transcript, September 17, 1903.]
STEEL PLANT CLOSED INDEFINITELY.

NEW YORK, September 17.
The National Steel Company's plant at South Columbus, Ohio, which is controlled by the Steel Corporation, has been closed down indefinitely.

[From the Boston Herald, September 20, 1903.]
BIG SURPLUS OF COAL—MARKET OVERSTOCKED AND PRICES WEAKENING—MANY OF THE COLLIERIES ARE WORKING SHORT TIME—MORE ANTHRACITE THIS YEAR THAN EVER BEFORE—BREAKS RECORD OF 1901 BY 8,000,000 TONS—CONSUMERS GUARDING AGAINST ANOTHER STRIKE.

WILKESBARRE, PA., September 19, 1903.
With the market overstocked with coal, the advance in price September 1 has been followed by some individual operators trying to sell on a slow market at prices below the circular. They are not finding steady purchasers owing to the fact that not only are the coal yards full and large stocks in hand at the storage yards of the company, but most mill owners and householders have been steadily accumulating to guard against another strike. At present many of the collieries throughout the region are working short time.

More coal has been mined this year than ever before. For the nine months of the year 8,000,000 more tons have been mined than during the banner year of 1901, when the output was nearly 60,000,000 tons.

[From the Boston Transcript, September 23, 1903.]
TWO THOUSAND TO LOSE WORK—FURNACES OF LACKAWANNA IRON AND STEEL COMPANY TO BE BLOWN OUT.

LEBANON, PA., September 23, 1903.
Vice President Buckingham of the Lackawanna Iron and Steel Company corroborates the statement that the furnaces here and at Cornwall, Pa., will be blown out in a few days, throwing out two thousand hands. He said the company has too much iron on hand. Mr. Buckingham stated further that the building-trades strikes, causing delay in the construction of new buildings, have helped to necessitate the suspension, which may continue.

[From the Boston Post, September 24, 1903.]
STEEL PLANTS MAY SHUT DOWN.

PITTSBURG, PA., September 23, 1903.
The United States Steel Corporation may close all its sheet-steel plants in the near future unless the Amalgamated Association will consent to a reduction under the same plan as was agreed upon last fall. The reason is an overstocked market and the dullness of trade at this time of year. Last year the Amalgamated Association accepted a reduction of 3 per cent on all material made on foreign orders, and the steel company, it is said, intends to make a similar request this year. President T. J. Shaffer, of the Amalgamated, said that he felt sure that the limit would not be changed and that existing conditions do not warrant it.

PRODUCTION OF PIG IRON TO BE CURTAILED.

PITTSBURG, PA., September 23, 1903.
The Chronicle-Telegraph says, it was learned to-day that a movement is on to curtail the production of pig iron, beginning October 1. It has been suggested that the only way to keep the mills running through the winter months is to look for new markets, and the prospects of business abroad are being considered.

[From the Boston Advertiser, September 24, 1903.]
The building outlook in New York foreshadows the idleness of 50 per cent of the laborers in the building trades. This is not due to the Pittsburgh pinch in structural steel, as in Boston, but to the financial pinch of walking-delegate extortioners of the Parks stamp. Of the two pinches, Boston is preferable.

[Boston Transcript, September 24, 1903.]
MAY CLOSE SHEET STEEL PLANTS—STEEL TRUST WANTS AMALGAMATED ASSOCIATION TO ACCEPT REDUCTION OF WAGES.

PITTSBURG, September 24, 1903.
The United States Steel Corporation may close all its sheet steel plants in the near future unless the Amalgamated Association will consent to a reduction under the same plan as was agreed upon last fall. The reason is an overstocked market and the dullness of trade at this time of year. Last year the Amalgamated Association accepted a reduction of 3 per cent on all material made on foreign orders, and the steel company, it is said, intends to make a similar request this year.

President T. J. Shaffer of the Amalgamated says that he feels sure that the limit will not be changed, and that existing conditions do not warrant it.

PIG IRON CURTAILMENT—MANY FURNACES IN MAHONING AND SHENANGO VALLEYS TO CLOSE OCTOBER 1.

PITTSBURG, September 24, 1903.
The Chronicle-Telegraph says it is learned that a movement is on foot to curtail the production of pig iron beginning October 1. The Bessemer Furnace Association, which controls a number of furnaces in the Mahoning and Shenango valleys, has consented to the arrangement, but the details have not been agreed upon. It is certain, however, that a number of furnaces in the valleys will be put out of blast on the first of the month, but the number has not been decided. A falling off in the demand for pig iron is an indication of a falling off in the demand for finished iron and steel products.

It has been suggested that the only way to keep the mills running through the winter months is to look for new markets, and the prospects for business abroad are being considered.

[From the Boston Herald, September 25, 1903.]
TINPLATE PLANT TO CLOSE.

SHARON, PA., September 24, 1903.
It is stated here that the American Tinplate Company, a subsidiary property of the United States Steel Corporation, will close its mammoth tinplate mills at Newcastle October 1 for an indefinite period. Fifteen of the 20 mills of the American company here have been idle since September 1.

[Boston Transcript, October 1, 1903.]
TO MAKE LESS PIG IRON—FURNACES TO CUT OUTPUT 20 PER CENT.
NEW YORK, October 1, 1903.
A 20 per cent reduction for October in the output of pig iron was unanimously agreed on yesterday by the representatives at the office of Rogers

Brown & Co., 71 Broadway. The companies represented operate about forty furnaces in eastern Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Archer Brown said at the close of the meeting:

"The 20 per cent reduction of output decided on for October was based upon the September output, which was estimated as having been 5,000 to 6,000 tons of pig iron daily. This means that the production will probably be about 1,200 tons less daily than in September. There will be another meeting of the furnace men at the end of October to consider the situation again."

It was said by another furnace man that reduction in the wages of the furnace employees had not come up at the meeting. He said: "The committee at its last meeting informally discussed wages, and the result has been a 10 per cent decrease in the wages of the furnace employees in the Lehigh Valley and New Jersey districts, also including the ore mines in the neighborhood of Wharton and Oxford, N. J."

The western pig-iron furnace men at Pittsburg on Tuesday appointed a committee on reduction of output, and it is said that this committee will undoubtedly cooperate with the eastern committee.

[Paterson Guardian, October 2, 1903.]
CUT IN WAGES OF STEEL WORKERS—MEN ACCEPT IT WITHOUT A PROTEST—GENERAL REDUCTION IS 10 PER CENT.

OXFORD, October 2, 1903.
A general reduction in wages has been ordered, affecting the employees of the Empire Iron and Steel Plant here. The reduction will be 10 per cent. The new scale will be accepted without a protest. It is said that the depression in the iron market is responsible for the reduction.

[Dover (N. J.) Index, October 2, 1903.]
MINERS WAGES REDUCED.

Some of the employees of the mines in this section have received notice that their wages will be cut 15 cents per day, and it is said that the same rule is to prevail in all of the mines in the county in the course of a few days. This is occasioned by the big "slump" in steel and a consequent reduction in the price of pig iron. We are sorry to hear that such is the case, as it will affect hundreds of workmen throughout the country, and as a result the merchants will also be affected, because men can not buy necessities if they do not receive the wherewithal to purchase them. We sincerely hope that the operators will, in the near future, be able to again raise the wages of the men.

[New York Evening Post, October 3, 1903.]
CAN WAGES BE REDUCED?—A SERIOUS PROBLEM OF THE DAY—VIEWS OF AN IRON MAKER.

One of the most serious questions, in the minds of people studying the readjustment in our industries, has been the problem whether, when profits decline in the nearer or further future, labor will also accept reduction. An iron producer this week spoke as follows on the general situation to the Evening Post:

"The average number of orders now being booked by our firm is satisfactory to us, as far as volume is concerned; in fact, we are refusing business, not because we can not handle it, but for the reason that the cost of production makes it impossible to turn a large percentage of it out at a profit."

"There will, without doubt, be a number of people out of employment this winter, merely because the cost of manufacturing has been increased to such extent that it often happens that the firm refusing business is better off, in some cases, than the one accepting it. In my trade the cost of production has been increased 50 per cent during the past few years."

"There will be no trouble in reducing wages to a normal percentage of the cost of production if it is done without too much discussion. When circumstances favor the workman he gets beyond control and can not be reasoned with. On the other hand, when things begin to go against him he can be managed without much trouble."

"Another point to remember is that the labor obtained during a period of unusual prosperity is of a class inferior to that which can be had when conditions are only normal."

[New York World, October 9, 1903.]
THE REPUBLICAN "ADVANCE AGENT."

In the great Carnegie steel mills in Homestead notices have been posted of a "readjustment" of wages on January 1. No one expects that the readjustment will take the shape of an advance. The Homestead converting mill is closed for the year. The Wharton furnace in Morristown, N. J., was "blown out" on Wednesday for the first time in three years and notice of a 15 per cent reduction in wages was posted at the mines. No one knows when the fires will be relighted. Similar cuts have been made in other Pennsylvania furnaces. Thirty thousand coal miners are on half time because of an "overproduction" that has not yet benefited consumers.

It is awkward for the Republican party to be approaching a Presidential election with such inconvenient news from mine and furnace. Did it not in 1900 announce itself as the "advance agent of prosperity" and with confidence commend old Doctor Elephant as the ablest adviser for "that tired feeling" in business? Did not Wall street promptly take the hint after McKinley's election and proceed to "capitalize" the earth, the waters upon the earth, and even the air above it?

"It will be a great mistake," said a shrewd political observer recently, "if Mr. Roosevelt permits any crop failure this year." Crop failure indeed we have not suffered, but is it not an equally grave error of judgment for Mr. Hanna and Mr. Clarkson to allow any wage-cutting or furnace-drawing on the eve of a campaign designed to demonstrate that boundless prosperity is ours and that all we have to do is to "stand pat."

[Indianapolis Sentinel, October 9, 1903.]
HOMESTEAD STEEL WORKS ANNOUNCE A SHUT-DOWN.

HOMESTEAD, PA., October 10, 1903.
Notices were posted in the 35 and 40 inch mills at the Homestead steel works last evening announcing a shut-down of both these big mills for an indefinite period. This is the most important department of the Homestead steel works and employs over 2,000 men, all of whom are thrown out of employment. No notice had previously been given of the contemplated move.

[Chicago Chronicle, October 10, 1903.]
JOLIET, ILL., October 10, 1903.

Affairs at the Joliet plants of the Illinois Steel Company are in an uncertain state. Three of the main departments—the rod mills, the converter and billet mill—were closed this morning. No notice was posted; no one knows how long the suspension will last.

The first men knew of the order was last night at 10 o'clock, when that shift came on. The men worked until 6 o'clock this morning. Then all operations in this department ceased. The blast furnace, the merchant mill, and the machine and factory departments are running as usual.

Superintendent S. B. Sheldon this afternoon said he had not received any general order to suspend operations for an indefinite period, and did not know such an order was coming. He said he could not tell how long the departments would be down, but thought they would resume work next week.

WILL NOT OPEN THIS WEEK.

Reports prevail among the men that work will be started next week or the week after, but the prospects are not good for a resumption next week. The closed departments employ about 1,500 men. The reports involve also the wire plants of the American Steel and Wire Company here, but these are running as usual. An official said they expected to shut down.

The wire mill has rods sufficient to run for a week or ten days, with plenty of orders on hand. If the steel mills fail to resume within that period the Scott street plant will be forced to get rods from some outside source or close down. This wire mill is working double turn, employing about 500 men. The Rockdale plant of the American company has a partial shut down, due to the necessity for repairs.

[Press Association dispatch.]

SHEET STEEL MILL CLOSED FOR LACK OF BUSINESS.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, October 9, 1903.

Acting under instructions from superior officers, the plant of the American Sheet Steel Company at Struthers has been closed indefinitely, and the employees paid in full. The only statement made is that the volume of business is not sufficient to warrant operation of the mill. The Struthers mill is one of the finest of the American Sheet Steel Company's plants, and employs a large number of men.

[Boston Transcript, October 12, 1903.]

VANDERBILT LINES RETRENCH—ABOUT 1,500 MEN IN SHOPS ON VARIOUS ROADS DROPPED—SAVING OF \$3,000 A DAY.

NEW YORK, October 12, 1903.

Orders have been issued from here whereby 15 per cent of the employees in the car shops, repair shops, and roundhouses of the entire Vanderbilt railway system will be dropped. One thousand five hundred men will be thrown out of employment and a saving of nearly \$3,000 a day will be effected.

The order, which embraces employees of the New York Central and all subsidiary lines going out of New York, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, the Lake Erie and Western, and other roads, will have its effect in more than one hundred shops and roundhouses. It will take 300 men out of the New York Central shops at West Albany, N. Y.; as many more from Depew, N. Y., near Buffalo; a hundred or more from Elkhart, Ind., and Collinwood, Ohio, where the Lake Shore has its shops, and several score from the Lake Erie shops at Lima, Ohio. Besides this, on every division of the entire system where roundhouse mechanics, wipers, oilers, and laborers are employed, 15 per cent of them must go.

The action taken is explained by a high official of the New York Central Railroad as follows:

"First, the outlook at the present time demanded that retrenchment be made, and, second, that the condition of the rolling stock of the company is such that it can be made in the department which has charge of that with the least damage to effectiveness. That economies were necessary in all railroad systems, not because they had not been practiced, but because of the feverish state of affairs, has been known to every railroad man in the country for some time. This does not mean the New York Central or any allied line, but every road.

"There is regret because of this action, and everything is being done to soften the effects of the blow. In the application of the order the oldest married men will be saved first; then the younger married men, and finally the single men, according to their terms of employment."

It is stated by Superintendent Everett, of the New York Central's Buffalo division, that the reduction is merely the annual economic action, made necessary by the slackening of traffic. This statement is flatly contradicted in other quarters. It is asserted on high authority that while a slight decrease in freight transportation may be looked for, the real reason for radical reduction is found in a change of policy by the Vanderbilt management.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC DISCHARGING MEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., October 12, 1903.

The Call says within a few days between 250 and 300 men will be discharged on the coast division of the Southern Pacific, and that before the order for retrenchment is fully carried out 1,200 men will be out of employment.

[Chicago Chronicle, October 12, 1903.]

WILL DISCHARGE MANY MEN—SOUTHERN PACIFIC PLANS A LARGE REDUCTION OF ITS FORCE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., October 11, 1903.

Following the announcement that the Vanderbilt system in the East is about to discharge 1,500 men comes the news that within a few days between 250 and 300 men will be discharged on the coast division of the Southern Pacific, and that before the order for retrenchment is fully carried out 1,200 men will be out of employment.

[New York World, October 13, 1903.]

BIG ROADS BEGIN TO REDUCE FORCE—SOUTHERN PACIFIC WILL LAY OFF AT LEAST 1,200 BEFORE IT GETS THROUGH—OTHERS FOLLOW LEAD OF VANDERBILT LINES—BURLINGTON AND NORTHWESTERN ROADS WILL START TO CUT IN TWO WEEKS OR SO.

SAN FRANCISCO, October 12, 1903.

An order for retrenchment on a scale unknown before in the history of the Southern Pacific has gone forth from General Manager Kruttschnitt's office. Within a few days between 250 and 300 men will be discharged from the various positions along the Coast Division, and the service of a proportionate number on the other lines running out of this city will be dispensed with. In all it is expected that the present force of men in the employ of the road on its California lines will be decreased at least 1,200.

One of the first moves made was to consolidate the position of two train dispatchers and a train master on the narrow gauge system, throwing all the duties of the three places on the shoulders of the latter official, thus saving to the company the salaries of two dispatchers. Then the positions of traveling conductors along the divisions were scratched off the pay roll. Next the recently created positions of train agents were abolished. In the maintenance-of-way department it was decided to lay off 100 men employed on the construction of the double track south of the city. The carpenter force in the local shops of the same department was next to suffer, thirty-five men being laid off. Then an order went out dismissing various assistants along

the coast route. Even the night station agents, whose duty it is to report trains as they pass in the night, were dispensed with.

Some weeks ago a large force of men was discharged from the shops at Sacramento and several in the repair shops in this city are slated to go.

The reduction of the force on the other branches of the western system is proportionately as large as that on the coast division.

[Special to the World.]

BIG LAY-OFF PREDICTED—VANDERBILT OFFICIALS SAY OTHER SYSTEMS WILL REDUCE FORCE.

PHILADELPHIA, October 12, 1903.

Early and large reductions in the number of employees of the big railroad systems of the country are predicted by officials of the Vanderbilt lines.

Announcement was made to-day that 1,500 New York Central and West Shore Railroad shop hands will be laid off.

When asked whether the Pennsylvania Railroad has materially reduced the number of men on its pay roll or contemplates such action, General Manager Atterbury said:

"We have not reduced our force very much, and only as the exigencies of the service have required."

No men have been laid off yet by the Philadelphia and Reading Railway, whose traffic continues heavy. When a curtailment comes, if it does, it is likely to be in the shops and among the track hands first.

FIVE HUNDRED LAID OFF AT BUFFALO AND DEPEW.

BUFFALO, October 12, 1903.

Following the order to reduce the force of shopmen on the Vanderbilt system, about 500 employees have been discharged here and at Depew.

[Boston Transcript, October 14, 1903.]

RAILROADS REDUCING FORCES—ABOUT 20,000 MEN SOON TO BE DISCHARGED.

NEW YORK, October 14, 1903.

Several railroad companies have announced reductions in their working force, and it is expected that between now and November 1 nearly every railroad in this country will discharge some of its employees. Such action, it is explained, is not unusual at this time of year, but a larger number of men will be dismissed this fall because the railroad companies have been working abnormally large forces since early last spring. A natural falling off in traffic is the reason generally assigned for these railroad dismissals.

Basing their estimates on the reductions already announced, experienced railroad men say that between 15,000 and 20,000 men will probably be laid off by the railroads throughout the country this fall. There are about 1,250,000 railroad employees in the United States.

Vice-President Brown, of the New York Central, thinks that about 2,500 men may be dropped from the pay rolls of that system this month. The greater proportion of the dismissals will be from the car shops.

About 1,500 shop men, train men, and track men will be discharged on the Pennsylvania system. Vice-President Pugh says that most of the men to be dismissed will be recent employees, who were hired during the rush period of last spring. Few, if any, of the old employees of the Pennsylvania system are to be discharged, and no important work of improvement is to be suspended.

The Atchafalaya, Topeka and Santa Fe operating department will lay off about 500 men this month, and such improvements as can wait will be deferred until next year.

Not less than 3,000 employees will be dispensed with on the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific systems between now and December 1. These dismissals, it is said, are to be made because the work for which the men were hired is completed. It is probable that all of the transcontinental lines will cut down their working forces some after the crop shipments are over. The falling off in ore shipments has caused some of the western roads to take off about 10 per cent of their freight trains.

The Illinois Central will curtail its operating force anywhere from 600 to 800 men, and the Chicago and Alton will also make a small reduction.

President Ingalls of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis system says that at present there is a great volume of traffic over his lines, but he expects that it will be necessary to let some of his employees go as soon as the present rush slackens. The Lake Shore will dismiss nearly 1,000 men this month and the Michigan Central about half that number. About 300 of the Lake Erie and Western employees will be laid off on November 1.

The Erie management has already dismissed several hundred men from the repair shops and the operating force, and there will be a still further reduction between now and December 1. The West Shore will lay off about 300 men and the Boston and Albany an equal number. A gradual reduction in the operating force of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad is now under way, and before the pruning knife is laid away about 1,000 employees of this company will be out of work.

The Missouri Pacific and other Gould lines will reduce their working forces slightly, but there is to be no cessation in works of extension and improvement. The Wabash expects to increase rather than diminish the number of its employees on Pennsylvania improvements.

The Rock Island and the Frisco systems will lay off between 1,000 and 1,500 men this month and next.

[New York Post, October 17, 1903.]

REDUCTION IN RAILWAY FORCES—WHAT THIS WEEK'S ANNOUNCEMENTS MEAN—A REMINISCENCE OF A DECADE AGO—VIEWS OF RAILWAY OFFICERS—EFFECT OF THE ECONOMIES—WHY THE STEP WAS TAKEN.

Steps taken during the week by several of the larger railway systems toward reducing the number of workmen employed attracted attention in both financial and railroad circles throughout the country. According to report the railroads of the country will lay off between 15,000 and 20,000 men before January 1, 1903, including 2,500 to be discharged by the New York Central 1,500 by the Pennsylvania, and an equal number by the Atchafalaya; Union Pacific will dispense with 3,000, the Illinois Central with 1,800, Lake Shore 1,000, Rock Island and San Francisco between 1,000 and 1,500, New Haven 1,000, Michigan Central 500, and Lake Erie and Western 200. These are the rough and unofficial showing.

PENNSYLVANIA'S MOVE IN 1893.

The movement is in some ways more striking, in others less so, than the Pennsylvania's famous "ukase" of December, 1893. The directors then adopted the following resolution:

"In view of the fact that widespread and severe depression continues in all business interests of the country, seriously affecting the revenues of the company, the president is requested to instruct the heads of the departments to enforce the most rigid economy."

The circular letter issued by President Roberts in response to action taken by the board of directors, went on to say:

"The present panic is one of the most severe in the history of the coun-

try," and adds, "its effects are widespread. In 1857 and again in 1873 this company found it absolutely necessary to reduce expenses on all sides. The present depression has affected all industries, and we must again economize wherever possible."

Even after such sweeping orders were issued, it may be seen from the monthly reports of operations on the Eastern lines that the percentage of operating expenses to gross, which was 67 per cent in November, remained as high as 71 in January and 70 through February and April. But the cases of 1903 and 1893 are scarcely parallel. A banker who has figured prominently in the management of several important railroads, and whose authority is very high, outlined present conditions this week as follows:

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

"When some bankers in Wall street began, a year or so ago, to put their house in order, it was laughingly said that such men were unnecessarily conservative, and that such timid action displayed pitiful ignorance of true conditions. The country was marching on, and every day new precedents were being established. Owners of railroad stocks must be made to understand that the annual yield of American securities would in the future be no greater than the interest distributed abroad, and so on. The position of conservative Wall street, although the only 'blue spot' then, was correct, and such houses are not uneasy now."

"The policy of railroads in years gone by was to distribute increased earnings in dividends. Much has been learned since 1894, however, and during the past two or three years in particular income available from a larger traffic movement has been devoted to improving roadbed and equipment. In other words, putting the house in order. The cost of carrying on the railroad business increased during the prosperous years, as was to be expected, and it increased past the point where good judgment would wholly approve it. Now the time comes to test the wisdom of having made such large expenditures for developing operating efficiency. If the money was wisely spent, fewer men will be needed even if the present volume of traffic continues. All of the improvements were made with the idea of preparing for rainy days, and while I fail to discover signs of an approaching storm, sound reasons may be found for believing the country is returning to a normal state."

"From what I can learn, laborers are being laid off, both out on the road and in the shops. Under normal conditions, it is customary to reduce the force in the fall and continue such policy until spring. Such action this year can not be connected directly with the difficulties experienced in raising money. No doubt if the attitude of labor was different, and prices of materials not so high, there would be somewhat less reduction. In other words, the roads would not figure so closely in making reductions. It can also be said that no concerted reduction in wages can be carried out until gross earnings fall off considerably."

The executive head of a system in the middle West said that business had increased to such an extent in the territory directly served by his road during the nine months ending with September 30 that it was found necessary to add largely to equipment and to increase the number of employees.

THE EAST'S JUDGMENT AND THE WEST'S.

"But," he added, "the manufacturing center of the United States is only a short distance west of Pittsburgh, you know, and roads in the East are apt to notice a contraction in the freight movement before we feel it."

"Some of our neighbors who have been expending large sums during the past five years in betterments, in the improvement of roadway, and for equipment, apprehensive that the industrial progress may be checked, have concluded to reduce the number of their employees in those departments where such reduction can be made without serious detriment. The majority of the roads are in position to suspend, for one or more years, the renewal of rails without any apparent deterioration of track; and the large addition of modern engines and new equipment enables them to suspend a large percentage of their shop forces until the outlook for the future becomes more hopeful."

"The large east-bound tonnage is still producing a shortage in cars, notwithstanding the large additions that have been made in the past year, and the number of employees required for train service will, in my opinion, be increased rather than diminished in the immediate future. Railroad companies, like private individuals, employ men when their business requires it and discharge them when the necessity therefor occurs, and I believe that the additional help required in the transportation department will offset the number of hands discharged in other departments; so that the total number of employees will be about the same."

NOT WHOLLY A QUESTION OF MONEY.

"I do not believe that any important railroad is discharging employees on account of difficulty in raising money; the question of raising money is not in any way involved in the matter. No doubt corporations will be influenced by the financial conditions and the money market in determining upon extended development and extensions; but it does not in the least affect the operation or maintenance of the property. I do not believe that any reduction of wages is planned. If, however, the industrial activity be checked, employees will be deprived of employment and will seek other fields, making help more plentiful, which may more or less affect wages in the future, not only with railroad companies, but in all other fields of employment."

A transcontinental railway president took this somewhat different view. He said:

"The laboring man of to-day must ask himself two questions, and then decide to follow honestly the path suggested by the answer to one of them: Shall I work four days in a week for \$2.25 a day, or take \$1.75 a day for a full week? A workingman can do a lot for his family in twelve months by guessing the right answer."

[Chicago Chronicle, October 18, 1903.]

RAILROAD STOPS ALL WORK—PENNSYLVANIA SEES HARD TIMES COMING AND ECONOMIZES—THOUSANDS OF MEN ON EXTENSION CONTRACTS TO BE DISMISSED—TRAFFIC OUTLOOK DOES NOT WARRANT FURTHER EXPENDITURES—NEARLY \$10,000,000 WORTH OF IMPROVEMENTS WILL SHUT DOWN NOVEMBER 10.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., October 17, 1903.

The Pennsylvania Railroad will suspend further operations on a great part of the vast improvement on extension work. It is estimated that nearly \$10,000,000 of new work already under contract will be stopped within thirty days.

Formal notice was given to-day to several contractors to suspend work on November 10. Other orders of like tenor will be issued without delay. An immediate result of this sudden action by the Pennsylvania Railroad to curtail expenditures will be the throwing out of work of several thousand men employed by the contractors.

The purpose is to stop all improvements and extension work from which direct benefit can not be derived this year, except where the work is so far advanced or in such shape that operations can not be suspended without danger of serious damage to the work already done. Heavy excavation work will be stopped.

Work now to be suspended will be taken up again only on its merits newly considered. Everything dropped now goes over to take its place among improvements and extensions which will be recommended for next year. Schedules of such work are now being prepared to be submitted to Joseph T. Richards, chief engineer of maintenance of way.

After he cuts out what he shall deem unnecessary or premature, the revised schedules go to William H. Brown, chief engineer, and from him to President Cassatt. Thus work heretofore approved and put under contract, but now stopped, must go through the usual course of new work proposed before it shall be taken up again.

The general stoppage of improvement work ordered was finally determined on by President Cassatt a few days ago. His decision was reached after consultation with Charles E. Fugh, second vice-president, and W. W. Atterbury, general manager, who confirmed President Cassatt in his opinion that traffic conditions now are not such as to require all the increased facilities planned.

DEADLOCK ON SHORTER DAY.

Negotiations between the committee of railroad trainmen employed on the Pennsylvania system and General Superintendent Atterbury, which were broken off Wednesday, were resumed yesterday by request of the committee. The committee spent the greater part of the day in Mr. Atterbury's office without making any material progress in the direction of obtaining any reduction in their working hours.

The opinion prevails among the committee that nothing can be gained by further conferences with the general manager, but it was determined to leave no effort untried to effect some agreement with the company before laying the matter before the Grand Lodge of Railroad Trainmen. The sentiment among the men in favor of a shorter workday is said to be very strong, and it is believed that a vote to strike would pass readily at this time.

[Special telegram.]

CLEVELAND, OHIO, October 17, 1903.

Following on the heels of the cut in the force of workmen at the shops of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad all over the country comes the annual announcement to-day that, beginning Monday, there will be a reduction in the working hours of a day from ten to nine hours in all the locomotive and repair shops of the Lake Shore Company.

This means a reduction in wages not only in the big shops in Collinwood, but also in Chicago, Pittsburg, and other large cities entered by that line. The Lake Erie and Western, a branch of the Lake Shore, is included in the order.

At the headquarters here to-day it was stated that there was not enough work on hand to keep the large forces busy, and the reduction in hours was thought to be the best thing to do.

The announcement has caused consternation among the hundreds of workmen in and around Cleveland.

[Paterson Guardian, October 19, 1903.]

CUT IN WORKING HOURS—LAKE SHORE FINDS IT HASN'T ENOUGH WORK TO KEEP ITS MEN BUSY.

CLEVELAND, October 19, 1903.

Following the cut in the force of workmen at the shops of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railroad comes the announcement that, beginning to-morrow, there will be a reduction in the working hours of a day from ten to nine hours in all the locomotive and repair shops of the Lake Shore Company.

This means a reduction in wages, not only in the big shops in Collinwood, but also in Chicago, Pittsburg, and other large cities entered by that line. The Lake Erie and Western—a branch of the Lake Shore—is included in the order.

At the headquarters here it was said that there was not enough work on hand to keep the large forces busy and the reduction in hours was thought to be the best thing to do.

The announcement has caused consternation among the hundreds of workmen in and about Cleveland.

[Boston Transcript, October 20, 1903.]

PENNSYLVANIA WILL RESIST—RAILROAD COMPANY CAN NOT GRANT DEMANDS OF TRAINMEN AND HAS BEGUN TO REDUCE FORCE.

PHILADELPHIA, October 20, 1903.

Forestalling action on the part of the 14,000 trainmen on its lines east of Pittsburg, in case of a point blank refusal to comply with the demands of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Pennsylvania Railroad has already made an important move to prevent trouble. As the most forcible object lesson that could be brought to bear upon the men, thousands of employees have been laid off and orders have been issued that the cutting down shall be from 5 per cent of the total force in some departments to 15 per cent in others. Not less than 6,500, and probably 7,500, men will be discharged or suspended as soon as the lists can be made up. This scaling down will fall heavily upon the trainmen, whose demands for shorter hours are now before the officers of the road. By laying off men the railroad will cut down its monthly pay roll between \$150,000 and \$400,000. High officers of the railroad frankly say that the demands of the trainmen can not be granted. The company, irritated, according to the statements of its officers, by frequent demands on the part of its men, will resolutely refuse to yield an inch.

[Boston Transcript, October 22, 1903.]

LABOR FACING A CRISIS!—INDICATIONS OF RETRENCHMENT EVERYWHERE—WAGES FOR UNSKILLED MEN FAR OUT OF PROPORTION—LARGE CONCERNS ARE REDUCING THEIR FORCES—THE NUMBER OF THE IDLE IS INCREASING EVERY WEEK.

CHICAGO, October 22, 1903.

Organized labor is facing the greatest wage crisis since the panic of 1893, if the forecast of its leaders is correct. And the burden of the struggle to maintain the present high standard of pay is expected to fall on the unskilled men, whose wages are held to have been advanced far out of proportion to the value of their services. Indications of retrenchment are seen on every hand. The railroads throughout the country have started to lay off men, the mine operators are curtailing expenses, and factories are employing reduced forces. All big employing concerns are refusing to grant any further increases in pay.

The tendency toward retrenchment is attributed to the abnormal increases that have been exacted by the unskilled workmen. While expert mechanics, such as the machinists and the brass workers, have been able to advance their pay only 15 per cent, their helpers are receiving 25 or 30 per cent more pay than four years ago. The same condition prevails in other trades. It has been estimated that before the close of the year the big employing concerns of the country will have discharged nearly 1,000,000 men, most of them laborers and general utility workers. Of this number the railroads are expected to drop from employment 200,000 men, the mine operators 50,000, the

machine shops and iron, steel and tin plants 250,000, and the building trades more than 40,000.

In the wave of organization that is now subsidizing labor leaders formed into unions all the toilers who were willing to join. In almost all of the industries the skilled men demanded that the unskilled be given a new and uniform wage scale. In the stockyards of the country the laborers there were being paid from \$1.25 to \$1.50 a day until swept into the labor movement. Then came an increase to \$1.75, made possible by a determined stand on the part of the skilled workers. For three weeks the skilled men, the butchers, sausage makers, and canners have tried to get more pay for themselves. They have found, however, that the increase granted the laborers—which meant \$1,500,000 a year to the packers—brought the employers to a realization that a halt must be called.

With the railroads conditions are similar. The engineers and firemen of the roads running east from Chicago are clamoring for better pay, but the unskilled men of the business already have taxed the pay roll of the company to the limit. The average daily wages paid by the railroads in different sections of the country is shown by the following table:

	Engineers.	Firemen.
Middle Atlantic States	\$3.76	\$2.14
New England States	3.50	1.98
Southwestern States	4.09	2.42
Pacific States	4.58	2.67

The Eastern workers look with envious eyes at the Western scale, but when they informally approached the railroad officials they were told that the track men, the repair men, the section hands, and bridge men have been raised all the way from 15 to 50 per cent in pay, and that the pay rolls of the Eastern companies have been lifted from \$610,900,590 in 1901, to \$876,025,594 in 1903.

In the building trades the number of idle men is increasing every week, the contractors finding it almost impossible to do business under the wage scales adopted last spring. Both skilled and unskilled men were conceded better wages then, but the advances granted the laborers are causing the greatest concern to the contractors. The hod carriers are now getting 36 cents an hour, or 3 cents more an hour than is paid an expert machinist, and 40 cents a day more than that paid a cigar maker. The building laborers are getting 30 cents an hour, or 5 cents more than a clerk or shipping room employees in the wholesale houses. The plumbers' helpers are paid \$2.50 a day, the junior steam fitters \$2.25, the electrical helpers \$2.25, and the machinists' helpers \$1.75.

An officer of the Chicago Federation of Labor issues a warning that organized labor should not ask for better wages in the face of a falling market. To prove that unskilled labor has been granted an abnormal wage increase, he gave out the following table of the increases already granted some of the unskilled workers of Chicago:

	Per year.
Stockyard employees	\$1,500,000
Hod carriers	229,000
Teamsters	1,100,000
Hotel employees	180,000
Miscellaneous	300,000

"The employers are beginning to retrench," he said, "and we have feared such action for some time. What is to be done I do not know. The skilled men will always be in demand, but capital can dispense with the unskilled to a certain extent. It seems as if we have paid too much attention to the laborers and helpers, and must bear the consequences. If many men are laid off, some unions probably will go to pieces, and the success of the entire movement will be threatened."

B. & A. REDUCING FORCE—PART OF MEN IN SHOPS TO BE DISCHARGED—PLAN TO USE FEWER CONDUCTORS.

WORCESTER, October 22, 1903.

Orders have been received by officials of the Boston and Albany division of the New York Central system, according to the Telegram, to reduce the force of shop employees as much as possible. As a result, 15 per cent of the shop employees at West Springfield will be discharged to-morrow and reductions will be made at Allston. Orders have been given that hereafter there shall be no extra conductors on local trains running out of Boston when those trains are made up of four cars or less. This will apply more to the trains running on what is known as the circuit than on the main line, although it applies to the South Framingham locals out of Boston. This move means a saving of \$75 a month on every employee relieved of work.

Unless business increases in the freight department it is probable men will also be discharged from it. There are many, however, who think business will begin to show an increase soon. At Rensselaer, N. Y., a large number of men have been discharged, and the orders to go into effect Friday are in accord with a recently issued order of the New York Central road to retrench as much as possible.

UNION LABOR METHODS SCORED—GAS ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT OFFERS PLAN TO GUARD AGAINST STRIKES.

DETROIT, October 22, 1903.

The thirty-first annual convention of the American Gas Light Association opened here yesterday. The following-named officers were elected at the conclusion of the routine business: President, Rollin Norris, Philadelphia; vice-presidents, E. G. Cowherdy, St. Louis; Charles F. Prichard, Lynn, Mass.; Charles S. Faben, jr., Toledo; secretary-treasurer, A. E. Forstall, Montclair, N. J.

Alton S. Miller, of Baltimore, the retiring president, in his address, attacked labor unionism and advocated the formation of the manufacturers' association to fight the unions. "The greater part of the laboring men," said he, "are good men and good citizens, but the laboring man's fault lies in his readiness to listen to the cry of the demagogues of the country. To guard against suffering from strikes, gas companies should increase the capacity of their storage tanks so that they can put in enough gas to last six months or a year. They should also ally themselves with reputable builders and manufacturers in all cities to prevent lawlessness in strikes, the destruction of output, and the interference with nonunion labor."

CHICOPEE UNION SURPRISED.

CHICOPEE, October 22, 1903.

The action of the International Textile Workers at Philadelphia in voting to send the officers to Chicopee Falls to investigate a small strike at the Chicopee Manufacturing Company's cotton mills was a surprise to union members here. The local union officials expected that the difficulty would be left to

them to adjust, if possible. The grievance consists of an objectionable change in the work in the picker rooms, where it is claimed more labor without additional compensation has been put upon some of the employees.

D. AND H. COMPANY TO LAY OFF 200 MEN.

ALBANY, October 22, 1903.

Notice has been given that the Delaware and Hudson Railroad Company will lay off 200 men, equivalent to 10 per cent of the working force. Second Vice-President Culver said that increased efficiency of administration, and not industrial depression or labor troubles, was the cause of the reduction.

WAGE ADVANCE FOR GLASSWORKERS.

PITTSBURGH, October 22, 1903.

The wage-scale conference of the shade branch of the American Flint Glassworkers has resulted in a wage advance of 5 per cent, and the members are allowed several minor conditions demanded by the men. The advance will affect 1,600 men. This morning the iron-mold branch of the trade will be taken up.

RAND, McNALLY & CO. SECURE INJUNCTION.

CHICAGO, October 22, 1903.

An injunction has been granted to the publishing firm of Rand, McNally & Co. against Franklin Union, No. 4, of Press Feeders, restraining the latter from interfering with the business of the complainant, picketing its plant and intimidating its employees.

[New York World, October 22, 1903.]

DON'T SHARE IN PROSPERITY—RAILROAD LAYS OFF 200 MEN WHILE BUSINESS NEVER WAS SO GOOD.

ALBANY, October 21, 1903.

Notice was given to-day that the Delaware and Hudson Railroad Company will lay off 200 men, equivalent to 10 per cent of the working force.

Second Vice-President Culver said to-day that increased efficiency of administration and not industrial depression or labor troubles was the cause of the reduction.

The road was doing the largest business in its history, he said, but it had been found that the work could be done with a reduced force.

[Washington Post, October 22, 1903.]

THE TIDE OF PROSPERITY.

Has the tide of prosperity really turned? And, if so, is this country going to have a time of serious business depression? That there is already visible a marked decrease of industrial activity is an indisputable fact. That the change will be as great as that of 1893 or the memorable trouble of 1873 there is no reason to apprehend. This country is more strongly fortified against financial disturbance than it ever was at any time in our history. There is vasty more of solid rock and a corresponding decrease of sand in our foundation. We have for seven years been riding on the crest of a wave of prosperity and progress that has been astonishing to the most optimistic of our own people and amazing to their competitors in Europe. Now we are slackening our pace. This is what might reasonably have been expected, for there was bound, sooner or later, to be a halt in the continuous growth of business. The Philadelphia Press makes these suggestive remarks:

"The strikes in building trades in New York, Chicago, and elsewhere cut off the demand for structural steel. Cutting off this demand deranged the entire iron market. Deranging the iron market brought a reduction in prices. A reduction in prices brought the necessity for reduction in output. The output of pig iron for the current year before this reduction began promised to be 18,000,000 tons. It has been reduced between one-fifth and one-fourth. The reduction in all is about 4,000,000 tons. This is worth about \$60,000,000. The great bulk of this, from ore up to the finished product, is labor cost. Practically the present depression brings a reduction in wages paid to labor of from \$40,000,000 to \$45,000,000.

"This reduction does not stop there. The railroad employees to-day number about 1,300,000. Five years ago they were about \$25,000. They have grown almost one-half in this time. This growth is in great measure due to the increase in annual production of iron from 12,000,000 tons five years ago to 18,000,000 tons now. The railroad employees increased one-half because the pig-iron product had increased one-half. It was not this alone which did it, but the rise in the output of iron measured a general trade activity as its shrinkage reduces depression. With the reduction in the output of pig, due in its primary cause to building strikes, there is certain to come a general reduction in the openings and opportunities for employment, of which the cut in pig iron is a measure."

The Chicago Journal declares that "everywhere employers are retrenching as far as it is possible for them to do, and the result is that soon more than 1,000,000 men will be out of employment in the very midst of good times almost if not quite unprecedented." We can not have good times of that description with a million workingmen out of employment. The Boston Advertiser takes this cheerful view of the situation and outlook:

"It is not as it was in the panic years when this country found no market for its wheat and the farmers were poverty stricken. Wheat and corn and cotton are selling at good prices. The great West has money to spend and will keep the mills and factories of the East busy turning out enough goods of all kinds to satisfy its demands. The people who have bought worthless paper will suffer from the paper panic; but there is just as much money in the country as ever, and it will be spent freely for what the mills and stores have to sell."

For obvious reasons the national capital is exempt from the worst effects of an unfavorable change in general business conditions. There will be much heavier disbursements of money for labor in this city in the next three years than there have been in any three years past.

[New York Evening Post, November 2, 1903.]

WIRE-NAIL WORKS CLOSED DOWN.

SHARON, PA., November 2, 1903.

The wire-nail works of the American Steel and Wire Company, at South Sharon, have closed down for an indefinite period, throwing about 1,000 men out of work. The mills have been operated steadily all the summer and fall, and part of the time were on double turn. Lack of orders is given as the cause for the shut down.

[New York Evening Post, November 4, 1903.]

CLOSING THE PENCODY IRON WORKS.

PHILADELPHIA, November 4, 1903.

Four hundred workmen in the bloom mill and the iron and steel finishing departments of the Pencody Iron Works were laid off to-day, making a total

of nearly 2,000 men rendered idle by the gradual closing of the big plants. The 8-inch steel mill will be closed on Saturday, which will complete the shutdown of the establishment.

[Journal of Commerce, November 5, 1903.]

REDUCTION OF IRON AND STEEL PRICES HAS COMMENCED—GENERAL LOWERING OF FINISHED PRODUCTS EXPECTED—RAW MATERIALS ALREADY GREATLY REDUCED—CONCESSIONS REPORTED IN NAILS AND SOME OTHER FINISHED LINES—SOME INDICATIONS OF READJUSTMENT OF WAGES SCHEDULES AS WELL.

PITTSBURG, November 4, 1903.

Reductions in prices on finished iron and steel products have commenced, and the opinion pretty generally prevails in well-informed quarters that there will have to be a material lowering in prices all along the line from coke or iron to the finished product before consumers will be tempted to come into the market and place their orders for the material, which they no doubt badly need, but which they have been holding off from buying on account of the weakness in prices which existed for so long. For some months the manufacturers of cut nails west of the Alleghany Mountains have had an association which controls the output and prices, and at a meeting of this organization held recently, the price of cut nails was reduced 25 cents a keg, or from \$2.15 to \$1.90 at the makers' works.

There have been no other official reduction in prices, but there is no reasonable doubt that the large interests have been quietly shading prices for some little time in the hope of inducing buyers to come in the market and place their contracts. These concessions, if they have been made, would not apply on plates, steel, or bars shipment prices on which are controlled by tight agreements and which so far as known have been recently held.

Should the steel billet makers at their meeting in New York decide to lower prices on steel billets this action would probably be followed by reductions in prices on bar steel and plates. It is not so certain that prices of structural material would be cut, as this trade is a very important branch of the steel business and is controlled thoroughly by the six concerns comprising the Beam pool for the past three or four years. Prices on all kinds of iron and steel products, and on ore and coke as well, have been abnormally high, due to the unprecedented demand. Now that we have returned to a normal condition again it is but natural to assume that prices will seek a lower level to meet the new conditions existing in the iron trade.

The coming reductions in prices will not only apply to pig iron, steel, and finished products, but on ore and coke as well. Six years ago coke used by blast furnaces sold at \$4 and \$5 a ton, but to-day the same quality of coke can be bought at \$2 a ton. Prices on ore are controlled by the ore association, and while it will be impossible to make any reductions on this year's contracts for ore, there is no doubt that when the ore producers get together their schedule of prices on the different grades next year they will make a material cut in prices over this year.

It is very evident, too, that labor will have to stand its share of depression now existing in the iron trade by accepting lower wages. The movement in this direction has already started; one nonunion rolling mill in this city has cut wages of puddlers to \$5 a ton, while the Amalgamated Association scale for the same kind of labor is \$6.25 a ton.

It is understood also that some of the nonunion sheet mills have taken the initiative of this movement by reducing wages about 20 per cent. It is also currently reported, but not officially confirmed, that the Carnegie Steel Company is preparing lower schedules of wages for its thousands of employees in the Braddock, Homestead, and Duquesne mills. If this proves true it is certain that the reductions in wages will be made at all the mills and blast furnaces owned by the United States Steel Corporation, of which the Carnegie Company is a part. While some labor troubles may follow as a result of these reductions in wages it is hoped the men will see the wisdom and necessity of accepting them, particularly in view of the fact that the employers voluntarily raised wages when the boom was on in the iron market.

Unusual interest was taken in the iron and steel situation here yesterday because of certain reports indicating a reduction in prices. The first of these originated in connection with the steel-billet pool, which, it is understood, held a meeting, and rumor had it that a reduction to \$23 per ton had been recommended. Then it was reported that the steel-rail pool will hold a meeting to-day, said to be for the purpose of considering a reduction in the price of rails. Naturally the trade and Wall street were much disturbed over these reports and the United States Steel stocks made a very close approach to the low records of the year, while the bond sold a small fraction under the previous low price. No satisfaction could be obtained as to the rumored or proposed cut in the billets and rails, hence the whole situation is surrounded with much uncertainty. President Corey, Judge Gary, and other officials of the Steel Trust were reticent and positively refused to discuss the matter.

What attracted attention early in the day to a possible change in the long-established schedule was a statement over the election holiday that the London agents of the United States Steel Corporation had effected an important sale of steel in England. In this case it is practically admitted that such a sale has been made and that it involves a very heavy tonnage. It is understood that details of the order or orders booked abroad will soon arrive by mail, and in the meantime only general information is obtainable.

It has been an open secret for some time that the steel trust was actively working to secure a foothold in foreign markets. There was, of course, no object in making such a move while domestic consumption was in excess of production, but with a reversal of these conditions the trust found it necessary to secure outside markets in case the mills were to be kept running. Reasonably, English and German manufacturers are not likely to stand idly by and see their home markets invaded by such a powerful competitor as the United States Steel Corporation without making an effort to retain their trade. As everyone knows, the steel trust is in a position to obtain special freight rates, but the consensus of opinion is that a reduction in transportation charges alone would not be sufficient to secure foreign orders in volume. It is this that has led up to the belief that price reductions have been resorted to, a theory that gained credence because of yesterday's meeting of the steel-billet pool and the rumors that followed it.

Referring to the iron and steel situation the Iron Age to-day will say: "A number of the Southern producers have again given way, so that transactions on the basis of \$9.50 for No. 2 foundry, Birmingham, have been made on a fairly liberal scale. Our Cincinnati correspondent reports the sale, for export, of a lot of 15,000 tons of southern pig on the basis of \$9.50 for No. 2 foundry and \$8.50 for gray forge. From Birmingham we hear of two small sales, also destined to Great Britain. The demand from the Mediterranean is said to be very light. In Cincinnati one large smelting interest earlier in the week took 15,000 tons on the basis of \$9.75 for No. 2. The pace set by the southern producers must have widespread effects, since there can be no hope now for months to come for many furnaces there and in other parts of the country to continue in operation."

"Natural causes are bringing about what agreements have failed to do either in the South or in the East. The foundry industry is little affected by what is being done in the Central West. Prices in the Birmingham district have now reached a point when the export business seems nearly possible without any special sacrifices, and that in itself is a warning to buyers not to press too

long. It is thoroughly well understood that the yards of the foundries are exceptionally bare, and during the last week there have been many signs that some melters are realizing this. The talk of the excessive cost of production has little influence upon buyers, yet the suddenness of the decline will cause many producers to pause who might otherwise have gone on hoping against hope.

There are a good many rumors relating to export sales of finished iron and steel. We can not hear that much has been done, nor are the prices obtainable very tempting. Some minor sales of steel rails have been made, among them a 4,000-ton lot to Japan and about 5,000 tons to Korea. But a South American order was lost. The rail makers are to meet to-morrow. Reports relating to finished material in the domestic markets are not favorable. Cut nails have been reduced 25 cents per keg in price. Concessions on plates and bars are being made through the aid of crowding tonnage into distant markets. Lower prices have been made on sheets. The steel pool is still in session as we go to press. There is some curiosity in the trade relative to the methods to be used to make "official" prices effective now which have been ignored for some time past.

[New York Journal of Commerce, November 9, 1903.]

ILLINOIS STEEL COMPANY DISCHARGES 2,000 MORE MEN.

CHICAGO, November 8, 1903.

Two thousand men were laid off by the Illinois Steel Works at South Chicago Saturday night. In addition to this reduction 1,200 men who were discharged two weeks ago, and who expected to return to work to-morrow morning, have been informed that there is no work for them.

The officials of the company refuse to talk about the retrenchment going on, but it is said by the men that they are being laid off because of curtailment in the output.

[Johnstown Daily Democrat, November 10, 1903.]

ONE THOUSAND ARE OUT OF EMPLOYMENT—MANY LORAIN PEOPLE NOW BACK IN JOYFUL CITY—PERIOD OF IDLENESS NOW—NOT KNOWN EXACTLY WHEN PLANT IN OHIO CITY WILL RESUME OPERATIONS.

A large number of people from Lorain, Ohio, formerly residents of Johnstown, are at present visiting friends and relatives in this city. As stated some time ago in the Democrat, the mills at that place have all been closed down, and as a result about 1,000 men are out of employment.

Although it was asserted that the mills would be again started January 1, a man conversant with the situation stated last night that when the foremen notified the men some weeks ago of the closedown they did not tell when the works would again be started. The Lorain company has a large number of men at work repairing the mills. Some of the Lorain men who came to Johnstown have secured work with the Cambria company and will again locate here.

[Johnstown Democrat, November 10, 1903.]

WAGE REDUCTION AND IDLENESS STILL RULE—READING IRON COMPANY POSTS NOTICE TO MEN—DEPARTMENTS SHUT DOWN.

READING, November 9, 1903.

The Reading Iron Company to-day decided on a reduction in puddlers' wages from \$4.50 to \$4 a ton. Other reductions will range from \$3 to 10 per cent. The reduction will take effect November 16. In the notices posted it says that in order to keep the works going the cost of production must be decreased. The department already closed employed 300 hands, and the company promises to make every effort to keep all its other plants going.

The new universal mill of the Reading Iron Company has closed down, affecting about 150 men. The company's sheet mill and the Olney street mill shut down in some departments to-day.

A large number of employees in the riveting department of the Sternbergh plant of the American Iron and Steel Company, this city, were laid off. All the suspensions referred to above are for an indefinite period.

The Phoenix Iron Company at Phoenixville has posted notices advising its workmen of a 5 per cent reduction in wages. The works are now overrun with men looking for work, owing to the closing of the Pencoyd mills.

[From the Washington Star, November 10, 1903.]

REDUCTION OF WAGES.

READING, PA., November 9, 1903.

A notice was posted to-day at the tube mill of the Reading Iron Company that the wages of the employees would be subject to a reduction according to the amount of wages received. The reduction will take effect Monday, November 16. The puddlers will be reduced from \$4.50 to \$4 a ton, and all other classes will be reduced from 3 to 10 per cent.

[From the Journal of Commerce, November 12, 1903.]

BLOWERS PUT OUT OF WORK BY MACHINES—ORGANIZING COMPANY.

GREENSBURG, PA., November 11, 1903.

Thrown out of employment by the installation of glass-making machines in the Jeannette plant of the American Window Glass Company, a half hundred blowers of Jeannette, with their full complement of gatherers, flat-tenders, and cutters, are organizing a company to build a cooperative plant at a cost of \$100,000. Bonuses have been offered by Greensburg and Jeannette.

Over 1,000 men were thrown out of employment by the machines in Jeannette, and barely half of them have been able to get positions in the cooperative plants of western Pennsylvania and Ohio.

[From the Washington Post, November 12, 1903.]

CUT IN COTTON WAGES.

BOSTON, November 11, 1903.

Reports from the centers of the cotton-mill industry throughout New England indicate that to-day's announcement at Fall River that a 10 per cent reduction in wages had been decided upon by the cotton manufacturers there, to go into effect November 23, has caused general uneasiness, due to the belief that an equal reduction at other places is inevitable. It is conceded that this will be the case in Rhode Island and eastern Connecticut, and it is thought other cities in eastern Massachusetts may follow the example set by Fall River, though their cases are somewhat dissimilar.

SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND.

In Taunton the Corr Manufacturing Company has already announced a 10 per cent reduction, and while the mill men at New Bedford, Lowell, and Lawrence are reticent concerning their plans, they admit that the condition of the cotton market is all against the manufacturers. This is believed to be equivalent to saying that a wage reduction is something to be seriously considered. The situation in Maine and New Hampshire will hardly be af-

fects. Maine did not share in the wage advance of two years ago, and so has a negative advantage now.

The mill agents at Manchester, N. H., which is one of the largest cotton-manufacturing centers in the country, say that retrenchment has not been thought of so far.

Representatives of the labor unions in Fall River and other cities do not appear to anticipate any concerted action on the part of the unions in opposition to the new schedule. The union men have kept themselves well informed as to the cotton market, and to-day's announcement at Fall River occasioned little surprise. While not admitting the necessity for so sweeping a reduction, it is doubtful if any considerable number would join in a fight with the mill agents at this time.

BACK TO OLD SCALE.

Although the outlook at Fall River from the operatives' standpoint is a rather gloomy one, it should be remembered that the new schedule is really a return to the conditions existing two years ago, when an advance was made by the manufacturers. It was this advance in Fall River that led to the great strike in Lowell last spring. The Lowell operatives demanded the Fall River schedule, which was refused.

The present scale went into effect March 17, 1902. The price for weaving regular goods to-day is 21.78 cents per cut, and a 10 per cent reduction would make the new price 19.6 cents. The old price previous to the date given was 19.8, and this latter figure will prevail after November 23.

[From the New York World, November 13, 1903.]

STEEL TRUST CUTS EXPENSES \$54,000,000—THIS ANNUAL SAVING EFFECTED BY CLOSING PLANTS AND REDUCING SALARIES AND WAGES—ASKS THAT FREIGHT RATES BE LOWERED—EASTERN TRUNK LINES MEET ON TUESDAY TO CONSIDER A REDUCTION.

By the reorganization of its business the steel trust expects to save \$56,000,000 a year, and thus offset the falling off in its net income. Salaries and wages have already been cut, plants closed or consolidated, and now, as a further step in the way of economy, it plans to get a heavy reduction in freight rates.

A meeting of the Eastern trunk lines of the Central Traffic Association has been called for next Tuesday to consider a demand of the United States Steel Corporation that the rates to the seaboard on the products of the company be reduced in such a scale as to enable it to compete successfully for export business. Mr. Morgan's company, the International Mercantile Marine Company, has also decided to give the company low rates. It is estimated that the company will by these means save \$5,000,000 a year.

This action was foreshadowed in the exclusive announcement made in The World last Tuesday of the plan to reduce expenses.

It was stated on high authority yesterday that when all these economies have been carried into effect the annual saving will be 10 per cent of the gross earnings, which last year were \$560,000,000. This would mean an annual saving of \$56,000,000.

HOW THE STEEL TRUST HOPES TO SAVE \$56,000,000 A YEAR.

Salaries—30 per cent reduction upon \$40,000,000	\$12,000,000
Wages—20 per cent reduction on \$88,000,000	17,600,000
Freight rates, saving	5,000,000
Four per cent of men laid off, saving wages of	3,320,000
Saved in reduction of output	3,600,000
Saved by closing and concentration of plants, estimated	8,480,000
Total	56,000,000

BUSINESS FALLEN OFF.

How much the business of the company will have fallen off by the end of the fiscal year it is impossible to estimate at this time. The greatest falling off has been in the last three months. The last statement showed that the net earnings had fallen off more than \$4,000,000 for the summer quarter as compared with the same period last year. The company met this falling off by cutting the dividend from 1 to 1/4 per cent for the quarter. The belief was expressed in Wall street yesterday that the enormous reduction in expenses will more than offset the losses, and that by conservative management the present dividends on both classes of stock may be continued.

If the Rockefeller party, however, is in control, as it is rumored, it is possible that the dividend on the common stock may be cut off altogether. John D. Rockefeller is said to favor such a plan, notwithstanding that he is the largest owner of the common stock. Mr. Morgan, it is said, will stand out for the rights of the common stockholders, although it is said that he owns scarcely any of the common stock at the present time.

The World sent this question yesterday to fifty representative bankers in New York:

"Does Rockefeller own or control the United States Steel Trust?"

The following answers were received by telegraph:

"We know nothing about it."

"E. C. BENEDICT & Co."

"In reply to your telegram beg to say I do not know."

"WM. A. NASH."

"It's beyond our present knowledge, but do not think transfer books would show it."

"HENRY CLEWS & Co."

"We are unable to say, but would respectfully refer you to Mr. Rockefeller."

"ZIMMERMAN & FORSHAY."

"We unfortunately do not keep Mr. Rockefeller's books. You will have to ask him."

"HARVEY FISK & SONS."

[From the Philadelphia Record, November 13, 1903.]

STEEL TRUST'S BIG ECONOMIES—RAILROADS MUST HELP THE CORPORATION TO SAVE MILLIONS.

NEW YORK, November 12, 1903.

A meeting of the eastern trunk lines of the Central Traffic Association has been called for next Tuesday to consider the demand of seaboard on the products of the company be reduced in such a scale as to enable it to compete successfully for export business. Mr. Morgan's company—the International Mercantile Marine Company—has also decided to give the company low rates. It is estimated that the company will by these means save \$5,000,000 a year.

It was stated on high authority to-day that when all the proposed economies have been carried into effect the annual saving will be 10 per cent of the gross earnings, or \$56,000,000, as follows: Salaries, \$12,000,000; wages, \$17,600,000; freight rates, \$5,000,000; 4 per cent of men laid off, \$3,320,000; saved in reduction of output, \$3,600,000; saved by closing and concentration of plants, estimated, \$8,480,000; total, \$56,000,000.

How much the business of the company will have fallen off by the end of the fiscal year it is impossible to estimate at this time. The greatest falling

off has been in the last three months. The last statement showed that the net earnings had fallen off more than \$4,000,000 for the summer quarter, as compared with the same period last year.

[From the Johnstown Democrat, November 13, 1903.]

WAGE REDUCTION IN COTTON INDUSTRY AFFECTS BIG ARMY—FALL RIVER MANUFACTURERS MAKE 10 PER CENT CUT, AND THIS ACTION MAY BE FOLLOWED IN OTHER STATES.

FALL RIVER, MASS., November 11, 1903.

Notices were posted to-day in the cotton mills of this city announcing a general reduction of 10 per cent in wages, to take effect November 23. About 50,000 operatives are affected.

The cut down is attributed to the unsettled state of the cotton-goods trade resulting from the high price of raw material and to a pronounced hesitation to buy on the part of the usual purchasers. The action taken in Fall River is one of widespread importance, since a step of this nature in this city usually is followed by mill owners in southern and central Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and eastern Connecticut, where a total of about 50,000 men are employed.

As soon as the news of the reduction was announced, officials of the Textile Workers' Union began making arrangements for a conference to consider the situation. It is thought, however, that a general strike will not be ordered here at this time for the reason that many of the manufacturers are short of cotton and have large stocks of goods on hand, which would make a strike of little consequence to them.

BOSTON, November 11, 1903.

Reports from the centers of the cotton mill industry throughout New England indicate that to-day's announcement at Fall River that a 10 per cent reduction in wages had been decided upon by the cotton manufacturers there has caused general uneasiness, due to the fact that an equal reduction at other places is inevitable. It is conceded that this will be the case in Rhode Island and eastern Connecticut, and it is thought that other cities in eastern Massachusetts may follow the example set by Fall River, though their cases are somewhat dissimilar.

In Taunton the Carr Manufacturing Company, employing 700 hands, has already announced a 10 per cent reduction, and while the mill men at New Bedford, Lowell, and Lawrence are reticent concerning their plans, they admit that the condition of the market is all against the manufacturers. This is believed to be equivalent to saying that a wage reduction is something to be seriously considered.

[From the Washington Post, November 13, 1903.]

TO CUT STEEL WAGES—BUT EMPLOYEES ARE TO EARN AS MUCH AS BEFORE—WILL IMPROVE THE PLANTS—PITTSBURG MANUFACTURERS GIVE EXPLANATIONS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE INDUSTRY—PRICES OF FINISHED PRODUCTS TO BE MAINTAINED—RECENT MARKED BETTERMENT OF TRADE CONDITIONS.

PITTSBURG, PA., November 12.

Two clearly expressed explanations of the conditions that are confronting the steel trade of this country, the one affecting the current prices and the other the more serious question of wage reductions, were made to-day by one of the high officials of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Company.

These explanations are supplemented and supported by other steel manufacturers, all of whom have been in close touch with the recent conferences in New York, and even prominent in the debates that have taken place there.

Briefly outlined, the reductions in billets and bars were made after the whole situation was gone over and it was seen that the trade would undoubtedly be benefited by such a change. In the discussion over the other finished lines of steel, such as plates, rails, structural shapes, etc., it was shown that during the past month or six weeks trade had shown such marked signs of improvement that there was no occasion for alarm and no reason for changing the present prices, which are normal and have been maintained even when the disposition to increase them would have met with no objection by the consumers.

QUESTION OF WAGE REDUCTION.

New business coming in is booked at a close figure, especially with billets at the new price of \$23 a ton, and the manufacturers realize that the present wage rate is too high for the prices of material. Wage reduction is unquestionably a matter that has to be faced. The reduction, which so far as known has been decided upon, can be placed approximately at 10 per cent, this covering the entire pay roll.

Continuing the information given, it was explained that the reduction of 10 per cent does not mean a flat slicing off of 10 per cent of the daily wages of the employee of a manufacturing concern. A straight reduction of 10 per cent on the pay roll of the United States Steel Corporation would necessitate a cutting out of \$12,000,000. The day laborer will not be affected, but every tonnage man will be.

EFFECT ON TONNAGE MEN.

The effect on the tonnage man, however, will not be in decreasing his earning power, but, rather, by increasing his tonnage capacity with improved machinery, which will enable him to turn out an increased amount of finished steel at a less rate per ton, the total being practically the same as he has always made.

Citing an instance for illustration, on this point, the official said:

"A tonnage man, we'll say, is running out 100 tons of steel a day. We increase the efficiency of his mill, move it a little faster, and enable him with practically the same effort to turn out 110 tons of steel, for which we pay 10 per cent less per ton, but in the total he will get as much for the 110 tons as he had been getting for the 100 tons before. He makes his same wages and we get the steel for less cost. We can then sell it for less cost and do business satisfactorily."

Theodore J. Shaffer, president of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, has sent out a circular to the various lodges of the organization, asking for a vote on the proposition of calling a special convention for the purpose of voting on withdrawing the limit of output on sheet mills.

[From the Washington Post November 17, 1903.]

EIGHT HUNDRED MEN IDLE.

PHOENIXVILLE, PA., November 17, 1903.

About 800 men have been rendered idle by the closing of the steel plant and several other departments operated by the Phoenix Iron Company.

[From the Washington Post November 14, 1903.]

CLOSED FOR INDEFINITE PERIOD.

CHICAGO, November 14, 1903.

As a consequence of the general reduction in wages in the iron trades the mills of the Inland Steel Company, the chief industry at Indiana Harbor, Ind., closed last night for an indefinite period.

[From the New York Post November 14, 1903.]

STEEL MILLS CLOSED—A SHUT-DOWN IN INDIANA BECAUSE MEN REFUSED LOWER WAGES.

CHICAGO, November 14, 1903.

As a consequence of the general reduction in wages in the iron trades, the mills of the Inland Steel Company, the chief industry at Indiana Harbor, Ind., closed last night for an indefinite period. The immediate cause of the shut down was the strike at midnight of 350 members of the Amalgamated Association of Ironworkers. The strike was ordered by the leaders of the union because the company sought to cut wages to the level recently established in most of the plants of the American Sheet Steel Company. The Inland Company employs 900 men.

[From the New York Post.]

BIRMINGHAM IRON MILLS TO CLOSE.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., November 14, 1903.

Announcement is made that the Birmingham Rolling Mills will shut down for an indefinite period. Lack of orders is given as the cause. More than 900 men will be thrown out of work.

[Boston Transcript, November 17, 1903.]

TEN PER CENT CUT AT AMESBURY.

AMESBURY, November 17, 1903.

The Hamilton Woolen Company has posted notices of a 10 per cent reduction in wages to take effect November 23. The company has 800 employees with a weekly pay roll of \$6,000. Agent M. W. Quinn said the company was following the lead of Fall River in returning to the former schedule of wages.

[From the Washington Post, November 18, 1903.]

REDUCTION FORCED TO MEET AMERICAN COMPETITION MAY CAUSE STRIKE.

HALIFAX, N. S., November 18, 1903.

The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of Sydney, has given notice of a general reduction of 10 to 33 per cent in the wages and salaries of all its employees, to take effect December 1 next. It is stated by the company's manager at Sydney that the cut was made necessary by the announcement that the United States Steel Corporation had made a revision of its salary list, the Dominion company being compelled to reduce expenses in order to compete with its American rival.

[From the New York World November 22, 1903.]

EXPORTS AND CUT WAGES.

The steel trust officials are said to be "practically agreed that reductions in wages will undoubtedly have to be made."

Is this in preparation for the revival of the export trade in the trust's products which is now under way? English steel makers are apprehending an enormous "dumping" of the surplus production of our trust's vast system of mines and mills at prices which will make a market for it.

Mr. Schwab wrote to Mr. Frick some time ago that "we can make rails for less than \$12 per ton, leaving a nice margin on foreign business," and said that "what is true of rails is equally true of other steel products." He proposed to sell to the English rails at \$19 per ton, for which the trust charged its home customers \$28. The trust was aided and abetted in this extortion by the Dingley duty of \$3 per ton on steel rails—a duty for which the Republicans "stand pat."

A year ago, when the highly protected glass industry wanted to sell its surplus abroad rather than to stimulate its sale at home by reducing prices, it asked its workmen to accept a cut in wages to promote the operation. The steel trust is apparently preparing to follow the precedent. And this is how our tariff for monopoly and a surplus "protects American workingmen against the pauper labor of Europe."

[From the Journal of Commerce, November 20, 1903.]

THE REDUCTION OF WAGES IN COTTON MILLS.

The Textile Council at Fall River, which includes the various unions of cotton-mill operatives there, has acquiesced in the 10 per cent reduction of wages with a very bad grace. The preamble of the resolutions adopted shows a recognition of the fact that it was inevitable and that the alternative would probably be a closing of the mills for a time and an absolute loss of employment in the winter, after the experience of partial loss for months in the summer and early fall when it could be more easily borne. It is implied that the manufacturers admitted that "a reduction of wages was not a remedy for the prevailing conditions." Perhaps they did, but it may be a necessity whether it is a remedy or not. It will not increase the actual supply of raw cotton, and it will not bring down the price, as the closing of the mills might by curtailing consumption and so diminishing the demand. It certainly will reduce the cost of producing cloth and so tend to revive the market for the product.

The mills could not be expected to continue indefinitely making cotton cloth at a loss, and the unions would have shown more intelligence and a better spirit by cheerfully agreeing to the reduction, as they evidently did not prefer a stoppage or partial stoppage of the mills.

The Textile Council in its resolutions declared that the representatives of the unions did not "consider the time opportune to enter upon a strike to prevent said reduction," but it protested emphatically against the short notice of the time for putting it in effect and gave notice that "at the first favorable opportunity we will make a determined effort to secure a restoration of said reduction."

That the time is not opportune for a strike is in itself evidence that the reduction was legitimate and that a strike would fail because conditions did not justify it. An intelligent understanding of the situation and the reasons for the reduction would seem to be sufficient to make the short notice appear a matter of small importance compared to a stoppage with longer notice. A cheerful and sensible acceptance of the conditions which the employers can not escape, and notice of the expectation that when conditions improved the operatives would get their fair share of the benefit, would have been more effective than a protest and a threat. Here was an occasion for showing a businesslike spirit rather than a hostile and belligerent one which there was nothing to justify, but labor unions seem determined to make a friendly cooperation between capital and labor instead of antagonism quite impossible.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 21, 1903.]

LEAVING FOR EUROPE.

More than 30,000 laborers have taken steamer passage for Europe from the United States since October 1, which is nearly three times the number that left during the same period last year. The shutting down of steel and iron plants is said to be the principal reason for the exodus.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 21, 1903.]

STEEL WORKERS QUIT.

Not all the steel workers are quietly submitting to reductions in wages. Those employed by the Inland Steel Company at Indiana Harbor announced to the management that they would not accept any such proposition and went on strike. The men were told that the mill would be shut down indefinitely, and both the open-hearth and blooming mills were also ordered closed. These men are not organized, and now it is proposed to form a union of the open-hearth workers in Indiana Harbor, South Chicago, and South Deering—some 500 in all.

TEXTILE OPERATIVES REDUCED.

Announcement is made by the manufacturers of a proposed 10 per cent reduction in the pay of 75,000 textile operatives in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. These reductions begin to take effect November 23. The officers of the unions affected are trying to get the manufacturers to reconsider their determination, but there is said to be but little hope of success. The high price of cotton, which is restricting the market for the finished product, has had much to do with this reduction in pay.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 21, 1903.]

The Brooklyn Eagle, in speaking of wages and commodity prices, points out a fact often lost sight of by those writing on the subject. While wages have been going up in some occupations they have been going down in others. Thus, in the report of the Labor Bulletin of the State of New York for June, 1903, the average quarterly earnings of certain organized trade unionists show an increase over 1897, but the true reason for this, as explained in the report, is that the principal increase in the men's earnings is in the growth of the groups that range from \$600 to \$900 a year, at the expense of those who earn only \$300 to \$600 annually. The proportions of men now earning less than \$300 a year is larger than it was in 1902.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 21, 1903.]

REDUCTIONS IN STEEL WAGES.

The most recent reductions in the wage scale of steel workers is summarized as follows:

Phoenix Iron Company, Phoenixville, Pa.—Reduction, 5 per cent; men affected, 3,000.

Reading Iron Company, Reading, Pa.—Puddlers' wages reduced \$4.50 to \$4 a ton; others, 3 to 10 per cent.

American Iron and Steel Manufacturing Company, Lebanon, Pa.—Reduction, 50 cents per ton for puddlers to \$4; nine-hour schedule.

Susquehanna Iron and Steel Company, Columbia, Pa.—Wages of puddlers reduced \$4.50 to \$4 per ton.

Sloss-Sheffield and Tennessee Coal and Iron Company, Birmingham, Ala.—Wages of puddlers and finishers reduced from \$6 to \$5.75 per ton.

Pennsylvania Iron Works, Lancaster, Pa.—Wages of puddlers reduced from \$4.50 to \$4 per ton.

American Sheet Steel Company, Scottsdale, Pa.—Wages tonnage men, rollers, heaters, and shearmen cut 20 per cent, operative January 1.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 21, 1903.]

A DESPONDENT ORGAN.

The National Labor Tribune, of Pittsburg, Pa., for over a score of years the representative of the interests of the steel and kindred workers, is not very optimistic these days. It hopes the turn in the slowing down of production has come, saying editorially:

"The darkest hour is before the dawn, as the old saying has it. One can not help wondering, in a survey of the iron and steel situation, whether this old saying is not applicable. The present iron and steel situation is, of course, not really bad. But there has been considerable reaction, and things are made to seem worse than they really are by the pessimism that is rampant in Wall street. Along with the disavowals of sweeping price reductions by the officials of the United States Steel Corporation come reports of a probable reconsideration of the curtailment of the furnace men.

"There are still more idle mills throughout the country than seemed possible during the flush times of a year or more ago. What is still more unpleasant to contemplate, a number of the shut downs appear to be for good, or at least for an indefinite time to come."

[From the Washington Star, November 23, 1903.]

WHOLESALE WAGE CUT—THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND MILL OPERATIVES AFFECTED—NEARLY ALL CONNECTICUT AND RHODE ISLAND MANUFACTURERS WILL FOLLOW SUIT MONDAY.

BOSTON, November 23, 1903.

The first of the numerous reductions in wages announced in the cotton mills of southern New England and at half a dozen points outside of that territory went into effect in all but one Fall River corporation to-day and at a number of outside mills.

Although about 32,000 operatives had their pay cut down, no general strike occurred in any mill. To-day's cut averages 10 per cent, and places the pay schedules on a basis with those paid previous to the advance of March, 1902.

SEVENTY-EIGHT MILLS AFFECTED.

The reduction affected 78 mills in Fall River, employing nearly 25,000 hands, and about a score of corporations elsewhere in New England, employing about 7,000 operatives.

The Fall River Iron Works, operating four print-cloth mills, will cut down wages next Monday, and on that day also nearly all Rhode Island and Connecticut manufacturers will adopt the lower schedule. A cut in New Bedford will go into effect in two weeks.

STEEL WORKERS QUIT.

Not all the steel workers are quietly submitting to reductions in wages. Those employed by the Inland Steel Company at Indiana Harbor announced to the management that they would not accept any such proposition, and went on strike. The men were told that the mill would be shut down indefinitely, and both the open hearth and blooming mills were also ordered closed. These men are not organized, and now it is proposed to form a union of the open-hearth workers in Indiana Harbor, South Chicago, and South Deering, some 500 in all.

TEXTILE OPERATIVES REDUCED.

Announcement is made by the manufacturers of a proposed 10 per cent reduction in the pay of 75,000 textile operatives in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. These reductions begin to take effect November 23. The officers of the unions affected are trying to get the manufacturers to reconsider their determination, but there is said to be but little hope of success. The high price of cotton, which is restricting the market for the finished product, has had much to do with this reduction in pay.

PARRY IS VERY ANGRY.

Because the new polo ring at Indianapolis, Ind., is being constructed by nonunion labor in part, the union men there refuse to work on it. This has stirred up Parry, the foe of union labor, who calls upon the business men of that place to unite for the purpose of "putting this union tyranny out of business." Just as if the union men had no right to make a decision as to where they will or will not work.

STILL RETRENCHING.

Retrenchment is still the order of the day with the railroads. Shop men and maintenance-of-way gangs are being laid off, accentuating the industrial depression which began in the iron industry and is spreading to many other activities.

[From the Washington Post, November 25, 1903.]

WAGES CUT 10 PER CENT—REDUCTION AFFECTS 25,000 NEW ENGLAND MILL HANDS.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., November 14, 1903.

The cotton manufacturers of Rhode Island, following the recent action of the Fall River mill owners in deciding on a reduction of 10 per cent cut in wages November 23, to-day ordered a general cut down, affecting practically every mill in the State and several in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The reductions will become operative in some plants on Monday, November 23, and in others a week later. In all, about 25,000 hands will have their pay reduced.

The order created no surprise, as it has been apparent since the Fall River cut that similar action would occur in this State and elsewhere throughout southern New England.

The first mill owned by Rhode Island men to announce the cut were those of the Quinebaug and Wauregan companies, in Danielson and Wauregan, Conn.

The Goddard Brothers, one of the largest manufacturing firms in Rhode Island, then posted notices in their big mills at Hope, Lonsdale, and Berkeley, R. I., and Blackstone, Mass., and announcements of similar tenor were rapidly made by other mills in the Blackstone Valley, including those of the Manville Corporation, employing 2,000 hands, and those controlled by Robert Knight, in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, which employ 6,000 to 7,000.

[From the New York American, November 25, 1903.]

TRUST CUTS THE MINER'S WEEK IN TWO—ONLY THREE DAYS' WORK FURNISHED TO TOILERS IN THE ANTHRACITE COAL FIELDS—LOSS TO THE WAGE EARNERS, \$200,000—"THANKSGIVING DAY" AN IRONY TO THE WORKMEN—ORDERS HAVE GONE FORTH TO ALL CLASSES OF OPERATORS THAT THE PRODUCTION OF COAL MUST BE KEPT DOWN.

WILKESBARRE, PA., November 24, 1903.

"Thanksgiving week" gives only three days of work to the miners of the anthracite coal region. It is a misnamed week to them.

President Baer and his associates in the coal trust are making good their admissions before the Interstate Commerce Commission, that, regardless of supply or demand, they control the output of anthracite coal.

The edict has gone forth that all members of this monster monopoly must shut down their mines for at least two days each week "until further notice."

Even Cox Brothers & Co., the largest and wealthiest "independent" operators in the field, who own their own cars and engines, as well as the D. S. and S. R. R., have been brought under the baleful influence of the trust, and have pooled their issues under the "community of interest" plan, and are only working their collieries three days of eight hours each and one five-hour day each week.

That this plan has been dictated and enforced by the trust is conclusively proved by the concerted action of every railroad identified with it in failing to furnish cars for the last two days of each week throughout the entire anthracite fields.

The loss of two days' pay each week to the miners and other employees in the anthracite field means a loss of over \$200,000 in wages each week to the men, and an enforced restriction of the output of hundreds of thousands of tons of coal.

If this coal was mined and placed on the market for sale on a competitive basis, the price would fall to a reasonable figure, but the trust decides that it shall not be mined.

As far as can be learned by an investigation made by the American, the collieries of the Lehigh Coal and Navigation Company in the Panther Creek Valley are the only ones that are working every day, and they have shortened the day's work from nine to eight hours.

[From the Chicago Blade, November 28, 1903.]

MANY EMPLOYERS REDUCE WAGES—THE UNORGANIZED ARE THE FIRST TO SUFFER—INDICATIONS OF THE SLOWING DOWN OF INDUSTRY—A FEW STRIKES ARE THREATENED.

Reports of wage reductions, in some cases followed by strikes, continue to be reported in the daily newspapers. A few are—The American Car and Foundry plant at Detroit, Mich., is to close January 1, throwing 5,000 out of work.

A 10 per cent reduction in the wages of all the employees of the Andover Iron Company, at Phillipsburg, N. J., is announced.

The Northern Pacific Railway has cut the schedule in its shops at Gladstone and Como, so that each man loses practically one day's earnings a week. The Great Northern has taken similar action in its shops at Como, Havre, and other points.

The first wage reduction in New Hampshire cotton mills during the present movement toward a lower basis was announced in the mills of the China, Webster, and Pembroke manufacturing companies at Suncook. The reduction amounts to 10 per cent and affects 1,500 operatives.

The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of Sydney, Nova Scotia, has ordered a general reduction of 10 to 33 per cent. The company feels compelled to reduce expenses to compete with the United States Steel Corporation.

Because of a cut of 7 cents on each 10 yards of silk woven, 250 girls struck in the Duplin silk mill, Hazelton, Pa.

Two hundred and fifty men in the Pennsylvania Railroad shops at Harrisburg, Pa., suffered a reduction of 10 per cent.

Notice was posted at Lock Ridge furnace, Alburdis, Pa., that another reduction of 10 per cent will be made in wages beginning December 13.

Nearly 10,000 employees will be affected by the reduction of 33 per cent of working hours decided on by manufacturers of bar iron east of Pittsburgh.

About 3,000 miles of Missouri Pacific track in southwestern Kansas and southwestern Missouri are without a section laborer except the foreman. The men quit work voluntarily upon receipt of the announcement of a cut in their wages.

Fifteen hundred of the 3,000 employees of the Pacific Steel Company, at Passaic, N. J., have voted to strike December 1, if the company makes a cut of 10 per cent in wages, as it has announced its intention of doing.

The Edwards cotton mills of Augusta, Ga., announce a cut in wages to take effect November 30. About 1,300 employees are affected.

The cotton mills of Fall River, Mass., owned by M. C. D. Borden, of New York, will follow the other local mills in the reduction of wages. Notice has been posted of the cut down of 10 per cent, to go into effect on November 30, a week later than that of the other mills. Nearly 10,000 operatives will be affected.

STEEL MILLS OPENED.

The steel trust has opened a number of idle mills within the past few days, which is said to be a hopeful sign. Requests are being sent in from labor organizations that if the mills are again put in operation a reasonable reduction in wages, to meet new conditions in the market, will be cheerfully accepted.

Manufacturers of bar iron east of Pittsburgh have decided to reduce the output by 50 per cent and to run the mills on part time for an indefinite period. The mills affected are: The Reading Iron Company, at Danville, Pa.; Scranton Bolt and Nut Company, Scranton; Boonton Iron and Steel Company, Boonton, N. J.; Diamond State Steel Company, Wilmington, Del.; New Haven Iron and Steel Company, New Haven, Conn.; Kinsely Iron and Machine Company, Canton, Mass., and the West End Rolling Mill Company, Lebanon, Pa.

About 10,000 employees will be affected. Until further notice four days' work a week instead of six, a reduction of 33 per cent, will be the rule. As the operatives are paid by the ton, the reduction will not affect them as much as if they were paid by the day.

UNION PICKET IS KILLED.

A lockout of 450 of the 2,400 members of Franklin Union of Press Feeders and Job Pressmen has been in effect since October 5, eleven of the largest firms having united in opposing the union, but while picketing has been going on every day since, no serious conflict occurred. There are widely varying accounts of just who is to blame for this shooting, and only a trial in the courts can determine it. It is a fact, however, that the fight is between two unions, the Franklin organization being outside of the unions affiliated in the printing business.

[From the Washington Post, November 28, 1903.]

GLASS WORKERS' WAGES CUT—REFUSED 10 PER CENT REDUCTION; NOW FORCED TO ACCEPT 21 PER CENT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., November 27, 1903.

The American Flint Glass Manufacturers' Association to-day announced a reduction in prices to the trade from 18 to 14 cents per dozen on one-third pint bottles and from 21 to 16 cents on one-half pint.

As the employees are working on a sliding scale, the reduction in price will mean a cut of about \$1 a day in their wages. About 1,000 men are affected.

Several weeks ago the members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union were asked to accept a voluntary reduction of 10 per cent in order that the manufacturers might meet the competition of the independent concerns. This the workers refused. The manufacturers then cut prices to the trade, and instead of 10 per cent the reduction in wages will average 21 per cent.

[From the Washington Post, November 29, 1903.]

REDUCTION AT CAMBRIA WORKS.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., November 28, 1903.

A general order issued by the Cambria Steel Company, taking effect Monday, will place the single-turn employees on a nine-hour basis. The order affects 13,000 men. The idea of curtailing the working hours of the mechanics, as well as all floating day labor, rather than effecting economies by a shut down, is to preserve the organizations, so that when the busy season arrives the Cambria shops will be effectively manned.

WAGES REDUCED THIRTY PER CENT.

PITTSBURGH, PA., November 28, 1903.

The De Wees Wood Plant, at McKeesport, will be placed in full operation the coming week, the first turn reporting on Monday. The men employed in the plate mill have accepted a reduction of 30 per cent, and others will go back to work at smaller reductions, which take effect January 1.

ROLLING MILLS CLOSED DOWN.

KITTANNING, PA., November 28, 1903.

The Kittanning rolling mill has closed down. The Kittanning iron furnace and the typewriter works are also closed indefinitely.

[From the New York World, November 29, 1903.]

WAGE-EARNERS HARD HIT BY TRADE DECLINE—MORE THAN EIGHTY THOUSAND MADE IDLE IN LEADING INDUSTRIES BY SHRINKAGE OF BUSINESS, AND MANY THOUSANDS MORE ARE WORKING ON A REDUCED WAGE SCHEDULE—RAILROADS NOT YET SERIOUSLY AFFECTED—REPORTS GATHERED BY THE WORLD FROM VARIOUS INDUSTRIAL CENTERS SHOW THAT PROSPERITY IS WANING—VENDERS OF LUXURIES FEEL THE CONTRACTION IN THIS CITY.

Careful inquiry made by the World through its correspondents at various and widely separated industrial centers of the country show that trade conditions are not what they were six months ago, and compared with a year ago are decidedly less promising.

These reports show that a readjustment to meet the falling off in trade is in progress, and that the readjustment in a majority of cases is taking the form of a reduction of wages from the high standard created by the stupendous rush of business during the past three years.

These reports also show that the reduction of wages has so far been generally accepted by employees without resorting to strikes or other forms of protest. The disposition of wage-earners in this respect is regarded by business men as a most favorable omen. In every case where a wage reduction has been enforced the mill or factory so affected has been first closed down for a few weeks.

SHUT-DOWN CAME FIRST.

This was done in the iron and steel mills of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and also in the case of the textile mills of New England. Many of these latter will resume operations to-morrow on a wage scale running from 10 to 20 per cent under that which prevailed prior to the shut down.

The managers of these mills argued that a period of idleness would prepare the employees for the reduction and avoid trouble for the employers. Many men with large interests and wide experience declare that the real tug of war will come when the railroads attempt to reduce wages. A railroad can not throw all its employees out of work for a month or two by shutting down operations, like a mill or factory, and in consequence a wage reduction is much more difficult to enforce.

So far the freight traffic of the railroads has shown no material shrinkage, though returns for passenger traffic are beginning to show a falling off. It

is argued that the business of the railroads must follow in the wake of the leading industries of the country, and that in consequence the railroads will find it necessary to curtail expenses by cutting down wages from the present high level.

So far the only steps taken by the railroads in recognition of the contraction in trade have been the stoppage of great schemes of improvement. In all, about 20,000 men engaged upon these works have been laid off by the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, the Southern Pacific, and other large systems. Other retrenchment schemes are expected to be put in force by the railroads within the next three months.

ALL LINES AFFECTED.

That the shrinkage in trade is affecting all industries was shown last week by the shutting down of twenty-eight mills of the International Paper Company in New York and New England. About 15,000 men were made idle by this shut down. The largest of these mills are at Berlin, N. H.; Franklin Falls, N. H.; Rumford Falls, Me.; Bellows Falls, Vt.; Glens Falls, N. Y., and Fort Edward, N. Y.

Business men in New York City declare that one of the surest barometers of general conditions is the state of trade among those who deal in luxuries. One of these, they say, is the theater. Another is the hotel.

Investigations made by the World show that the theaters of this city are doing less business than for years. New theaters with 7,500 seats have been opened this season, but theatrical men agree that this is of small moment in accounting for the falling off in attendance.

The determination of the public to husband its money was best shown on Thanksgiving Day, when only four theaters had full houses at the matinee performances and a dozen of them had rows of empty seats at night. This was an abnormal state of affairs. Thanksgiving has for a long time been the biggest theater day of the year.

There is an abundance of room at all of the hotels, though at a score of the leading hostleries a year ago they were turning away applicants every day. Café receipts have fallen off sharply, and at such places as Sherry's and Delmonico's the contraction of the public purse is most noticeable.

WILL SHRINKAGE CONTINUE.

According to trade authorities it is too early to predict whether the shrinkage is temporary or will prove to be a matter of years. Conditions generally are so mixed that they assert that there is no single fact to base a prediction upon.

The collapse in Wall street values and the coming Presidential election are regarded as temporary factors, but the consequences wrought by both it is believed by some will be more permanent.

Those having to do with the labor problem say that conditions are generally favorable.

DAILY PAY ROLL OF \$10,000 STOPPED—TEN IRON AND STEEL PLANTS IN BIRMINGHAM DISTRICT SHUT DOWN.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., November 23, 1903.

Ten iron and steel plants shut down, one on half time, 3,335 men idle and a daily pay-roll of \$10,000 stopped is the extent of the present trade depression in the Birmingham district. The following is a list of the idle plants, the number of men affected, and the wages paid:

One furnace of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company, in Birmingham, and another at Ensley, each employing 250 men, 200 of whom at each furnace earn \$1.25 per day and 50 at each furnace \$3 per day each.

Steel mill of the Tennessee Coal, Iron, and Railroad Company, at Ensley, employing 900 men at an average wage of \$3 per day each.

Birmingham Rolling-Mill of the Republic Iron and Steel Company, in Birmingham, employing 900 men at an average of \$3.25 per day each.

One iron furnace of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel and Iron Company, at Sheffield, employing 200 men at \$1.25 per day and 25 men as \$3 per day each.

Wire, rod and nail mill of the Alabama Steel and Wire Company, at Ensley, employing 800 men at an average wage of \$3 per day each. This plant has been idle five months.

One iron furnace of the Jenifer Furnace Company, at Jenifer, employing 200 men at \$1.25 per day each and 35 men at \$3 per day. This company is in the hands of a receiver.

The furnace of the Attalla Furnace Company, at Attalla, employing 60 men at \$1.25 each per day.

Furnace of the Williamson Iron Company, in Birmingham, employing 75 men at \$1.25 each per day and 15 men at \$3 per day.

One furnace of the Alabama Coal and Iron Company, at Talladega, employing 150 men at \$1.25 per day each and 25 men at \$3 per day.

The car works of the Decatur Car Wheel Works Company, in Birmingham, employing 100 men at an average wage of \$2.50 are running on half time.

Operators of the leading iron and steel industries of this district do not take a gloomy view of the future, but regard the present depression as temporary. As a rule they look for better times when the new year opens. Col. Thomas G. Bush, president of the Alabama Consolidated Coal and Iron Company, says:

"I regret to say that at this particular time the general trade situation is not altogether satisfactory. The present conditions are due to causes which are obvious, but not necessarily alarming. We have no reason to consider the present decline in metal prices as an indication of a long period of stagnation, as occurred in 1893 and for several years following."

J. W. McQueen, vice-president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel and Iron Company, declares that his company sold and delivered more pig iron thus far in November than in any previous month for the last year and a half. This served to relieve the situation by removing much of the surplus stock from the furnace yards. He looks for a good trade in iron henceforth.

Don H. Bacon, president of the Tennessee Coal, Iron, and Railroad Company, says that he expects a good demand for steel billets and rails and generally better trade conditions after the opening of the new year.

B. M. Starks, local superintendent of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, whose lines handle nearly all of the mineral traffic of the Birmingham district, said:

"I can not see anything but prosperity in the outlook. Our road is crowded with shipments and the shippers at the mines and plants are continually calling for more cars."

MANY THOUSANDS IDLE IN MONTANA—HEINZE-AMALGAMATED WAR REGARDED AS A MENACE TO THE PROSPERITY OF THE STATE.

BUTTE, MONT., November 23, 1903.

During the twenty days of complete suspension of operations at mines, smelters, and other properties of the Amalgamated Copper Company, 14,500 men were out of employment in Montana. The average wage of these men was \$3 a day, a total of \$43,500 a day, or \$870,000 for the twenty days.

Since the partial resumption about half the number have returned to work. The remainder are still partly or wholly idle, because the Amalgamated Company has limited its operations. In Butte 6,000 miners, receiving \$3.50 per day,

were laid off at the time of the shut down, and about 4,000 have returned to work, leaving 2,000 still idle.

At the Washoe smelters, at Anaconda, 2,500 men, receiving an average of \$2.75 per day, were laid off and 1,100 have gone back to work. Twelve hundred men were thrown out of employment at the Great Falls smelter at the time of the shut down, but a thousand have been returned to work at an average pay of \$3 a day.

Of the rest of the company's employees about 75 per cent of those laid off at the time of the shut down have been put back to work.

The trade outlook in Montana, especially in the large cities which depend chiefly on the mining industry, is clouded and, it is thought, will continue so until there is a settlement of the Heinze-Amalgamated litigation, or the Standard Oil influence is eliminated from the situation. The latter's power to close the State's chief industries at will is regarded as a menace to the business interest of Montana.

EFFECT OF TRADE SHRINKAGE IN INDUSTRIES ON LABOR.

Men made idle by stoppage of improvements by railroads	20,000
Men made idle by shut down of paper mills	15,000
Miners idle by partial closing of copper mines in Montana	4,000
Men idle in Pennsylvania and Ohio steel and iron districts (about)	28,000
Men idle in Birmingham steel and iron district	15,000
Workers affected by 10 per cent wage reduction in New England textile mills	65,000

FALL RIVER, MASS., November 23, 1903.

Between 60,000 and 70,000 workers in the textile mills of New England will go to work Monday on a wage schedule averaging about 10 per cent less than they have been receiving.

This means that the operatives will have about \$90,000 a week less to spend. The reduction has been accepted without any material friction.

It is not at all certain that the mills will continue in operation on this basis. Everything practically hinges upon the price of cotton. If cotton can be had for 10 cents per pound or cheaper the mills will probably run until the middle of next year. If the price of cotton continues around 11 cents a number of the mills will shut down.

The precarious condition of the trade is realized by the mill workers and accounts for their willingness to accept the wage reduction.

In Fall River alone about 30,000 workers are affected by the new schedule. In Rhode Island there are about 20,000 workers affected.

[From the Passaic Daily Herald, November 30, 1903.]

LOWER WAGES IN PATERSON—SILK MILLS CUTTING WORKMEN'S PAY—SOME OF THE EMPLOYEES THREATEN TO STRIKE.

Pelgram & Myer, one of the largest silk manufacturing concerns in Paterson, has announced that in its mills wages would be reduced from 8 to 15 per cent. Some of the hands are said to be willing to accept the cut, while others will go out on strike. The matter will probably not reach a culminating point until Thursday, when the time under the present wage schedule expires.

A general reduction of 15 per cent is also announced at the mill of the Johnson & Cowdin Co., another of the largest firms in the silk business there. Although there is general dissatisfaction among the employees there has been no rumor of a strike at the factory.

[From the Journal of Commerce, November 30, 1903.]

CUT IN COAL MINERS' WAGES.—COMPANIES IN THE MEYERSDALE REGION DECIDE UPON REDUCTION.

BALTIMORE, November 29, 1903.

It is announced that the Somerset Coal Company, the W. K. Niver Coal Company, and the Merchants' Coal Company, which own and operate a number of mines in the Meyersdale (Pa.) region, have decided to make a reduction of 10 cents a ton in the wages paid the miners. The cut will become effective December 16, and notices will be posted at the mines to-morrow.

The three companies employ upwards of 2,500 men, and it is expected that the other smaller operators in that region will follow with a similar reduction. It is said that so far the miners have no knowledge of the decision reached by the companies, but the latter do not believe they will make any protest.

When the coal trade was booming last April, the companies voluntarily advanced the pay from 55 to 65 cents a ton. Now that the trade is very flat and competition acute, it is considered necessary to take off the increase and go back to the old rate.

[From the Journal of Commerce, November 30, 1903.]

EVERETT PIG IRON FURNACE BANKED.

EVERETT, PA., November 23.

The dull market for pig iron has caused the Everett furnace to be shut down indefinitely. The force of workers will be reduced at the company's mines and coke works at Kearney. Many men have been thrown out of employment.

[From the St. Louis Republic, November 30, 1903.]

WAGE REDUCTION AFFECTS 64,000—OTHER NEW ENGLAND COTTON MILLS OPERATIVES YET TO BE INCLUDED IN CUT WILL SWELL TOTAL TO 75,000.

BOSTON, November 30, 1903.

The wages of about 32,000 cotton textile operators were reduced to-day.

To-day's addition brings the total number in New England who have had their pay cut down this fall to about 64,000, and the cut which takes effect in New Bedford next Monday will swell the total to about 75,000, and complete a general reduction in southern New England cotton mills. The cut down in the majority of factories averages 10 per cent.

To-day practically every cotton mill in Rhode Island, where there are about 2,200,000 spindles, adopted the new schedule. In that State nearly 20,000 operatives are affected, and the new order of things will mean a loss of fully \$20,000 weekly in wages. The cut also became operative in mills in Massachusetts and Connecticut controlled by Rhode Island capital and employing about 7,000 additional hands.

The reports from the mill district indicate that the new schedules were received without any serious protest on the part of the operatives.

[From the Boston Transcript, December 2, 1903.]

MORE MAINE MILLS CLOSING.

AUGUSTA, ME., December 2, 1903.

Lower water in the streams of Maine is becoming a greater handicap to the manufacturing industry daily. The Lockwood Cotton Mills at Waterville have been shut down in part, and at Hollingsworth & Whitney's mill in Winslow, 500 hands are idle.

[From the Boston Transcript, December 2, 1903.]

WOOLEN MILL ATTACHED—LAKEVILLE COMPANY'S PLANT AT WEST RUTLAND SHUT DOWN.

WEST RUTLAND, December 2, 1903.

The Stearns woolen mill here, owned by the Lakeville Company, is shut down, Deputy Sheriff James Early, of Worcester, having placed an attachment on the property in behalf of S. Rawitser & Co., of New York. A keeper is in charge. The suit is an action of contract to recover for stock furnished the company. About 60 hands are idle.

[From the Boston Transcript, December 2, 1903.]

MILL STRIKE AT TILTON, N. H.—WEAVERS RESIST REDUCTION OF WAGES, TILTON, N. H., December 2, 1903.

A change in the wage schedule of the woolen mills of O. & E. Morrison here is being resisted by the weavers, 40 of whom are on strike. The mills are shut down and in all nearly 200 operatives are idle. A notice was posted by the management giving a new schedule of wages for weaving. Some of the grades of cloth were cut a quarter of a cent per yard and a few grades were raised half a cent per yard. At the same time the management reduced its force of loom fixers. The overseer was dissatisfied to have his fixing force cut down and quit work. When he went out the entire force of weavers followed. When the weavers went out most of the hands in the factory had to go out also.

O. G. Morrison, manager of the mills, says that his men had no reason to strike, for the weavers admitted to him before going out that they had no grievance against the mills. "We have been using our weavers as well or better than most of the mills in the State," said he. "They have been making fine pay, and have had more fixers in proportion to the number of looms than other mills. It seems that the chief trouble was that Overseer Merchant was dissatisfied because we decided to dispense with one fixer. As for the cutdown, about 18 weavers are cut one-fourth of a cent a yard on a particular grade of cloth, while a few others are raised one-half a cent per yard and still others are not affected either way. Our object was to change the wage schedule to equalize, as near as possible, the rate of wages, and we think it a very fair schedule."

[From the Chicago Chronicle, December 2, 1903.]

STRIKE OVER CUT IN WAGES—MESSENGER BOYS QUIT AND NEGROES FILL THEIR PLACES.

RICHMOND, VA., December 1, 1903.

The Western Union Telegraph messengers struck to-day against a reduction of wages. The company is filling their places with negroes.

TORONTO, ONTARIO, December 1, 1903.

Everything points to a strike of the telegraph operators of the Grand Trunk Railway. The Order of Railway Telegraphers has given the management until 12 o'clock to-night to decide the question of granting an increase in wages.

PITTSBURG, PA., December 1, 1903.

An unsuccessful effort was made to-day to break the building trades' lock-out. Committees of the Builders' Exchange League and the Building Trades' Council held a conference without reaching an agreement.

SHARON, PA., December 1, 1903.

A reduction of 10 per cent in the wages of the 600 employees of the Sharon plant of the American Steel Foundries Company went into effect to-day.

PATERSON, N. J., December 1, 1903.

A 10 per cent reduction in wages went into effect at the plant of the Passaic Steel Company to-day.

READING, PA., December 1, 1903.

Because of a 10 per cent reduction, 200 employees of the North Reading plant of the Reading Foundry Company quit work to-day. The Reading Railway laid off 250 track repairers. The Sternberg plant of the American Iron and Steel Company resumed work on full time.

POTTSTOWN, PA., December 1, 1903.

The Ellis & Lessig Iron Company announced to-day that it will resume operations at its puddle mill Monday with a full force.

TOLEDO, OHIO, December 1, 1903.

Colonel Howard, general foreman of the Wabash car shops in this city, to-day received orders to reduce the force 10 per cent. One hundred men are affected. The shop is two months behind in its work.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., December 1, 1903.

The Chicago and Alton road to-day announced a 15-cent reduction in pay of section hands. The new rate is \$1.25 a day of nine hours.

MARQUETTE, MICH., December 1, 1903.

The Lake Shore engine works to-day posted notices saying the wages of all employees would be cut 10 per cent at the south shore railroad shops.

[From Iron Age, December 3, 1903.]

McKeesport, Pa., Tin Plate Company have notified employees of a reduction in wages. Some have refused to accept the reduction, and plant is only partly in operation.

The falling off in business in the metal lines is bringing home to the workmen the distinct benefit of the labor bureaus.

International Harvester Company, Chicago, have decided to lay off 7,500 of their 19,000 employees. Deering division discharged 1,500 Saturday.

Blast-furnace plants in the Shenango and Mahoning valleys have reduced wages 10 per cent. This reduction will probably become general in Central West.

[From the Wool and Cotton Reporter, December 3, 1903.]

REDUCTION IN WAGES.

About 32,000 additional operatives have their wages reduced this week. Total number in New England thus far affected, about 64,000. Cut in New Bedford next Monday will swell the total to about 75,000. Cut averages 10 per cent.

New Britain Knitting Company, at New Britain, Conn., has reduced the wages of some of its employees.

George A. Whitney (cotton) yarn mills, South Royalston, Mass., closed for three weeks, are starting up with 30 operatives instead of usual 125.

Richmond Manufacturing Company, of Bristol, R. I., has been idle since last July. Property (cotton mill) may be sold.

"Boroden Felting Mills Company, at Millbury, Mass., have gone on half time, with about half the usual number of hands."

Pitchburg, Mass., Cotton Duck Mills are shut down. They usually employ 200 hands.

Mechanicsville Knitting Company, New York, will soon close down indefinitely.

City Manufacturing Corporation (cotton), New Bedford, will reduce wages December 7.

Berkeley Mill, Providence, R. I., cut wages more than expected. The cut ranges from 6 to 13 per cent.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, December 12, 1903.]

STRIKE OF GIRL CRACKER PACKERS OFF.

CHICAGO, December 2, 1903.

The strike of girl cracker packers against the National Biscuit Company has been declared off. The girls are returning to work as individuals.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, December 3, 1903.]

LOWER WAGES IN WIRE MILLS.

JOLIET, ILL., December 2, 1903.

A reduction of from 5 to 10 per cent in wages was ordered to-day in all of the wire mills of the United States Steel Company, affecting 1,000 men.

STEEL TRUST PREPARING TO REDUCE WAGES—GENERAL REDUCTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION—MEETING AT PITTSBURG.

PITTSBURG, December 2, 1903.

The presidents and other subsidiary officers of the underlying companies in the United States Steel Corporation are meeting here to-day. The object of the meeting has not been given out, and President Dinkley, of the Carnegie Steel Company, when seen, declined to make any statement. It is said to be the most important gathering of the steel officials since the era of retrenchment was begun and that the most serious matter under consideration is the question of wages.

It is generally admitted that committees have been at work formulating scales of reduction, which may go into effect on January 1 next, provided the workmen are willing to accept the new conditions. The extent of the reductions contemplated, it is said, ranges from 10 to 35 per cent. Negotiations to establish harmony among the employees regarding the wage cut have, it is reported, been in progress for nearly a month past, and it is probable that some plan may be presented for approval at to-day's meeting. Officials of the steel corporation have been reticent regarding the plan to cut wages, but it is known that the men who are drawing the highest wages will be the heaviest sufferers.

At the close of the meeting this evening it was announced that the gathering was simply one of the monthly conferences between the presidents of the various subsidiary companies of the United States Steel Corporation. While much secrecy is maintained by those present, it is understood that the subjects having special interest to each company in the way of operation and in curtailment of production and extension of business were the main features.

The question of wages, according to excellent authority, was not taken up, as that is a matter for the officers and directors of the various companies to settle among themselves. Heretofore these meetings have been held in New York, but it is understood that President Corey has favored holding them in Pittsburgh.

The coming merger of the tin plate and sheet steel companies is to bring about a change in the location of the headquarters of these corporations, now in New York, as both will be brought to this city.

The Sheet Steel Workers' convention, at which the removal of the limit of production will be considered, will be held here next Tuesday. Notices were sent out from the Amalgamated Association offices to-day, ordering the lodges to select their delegates. At the request of the Independent Sheet Steel Manufacturers' Association the above date was selected. The association will be represented at the convention.

[From the Washington Star, December 3, 1903.]

ACCEPT REDUCED SCALE.

CHESTER, W. VA., December 7.

The employees of the Chester tin plate mill of the American Tin Plate Company have accepted the reduced scale offered by the company, and the entire plant will start in full January 1.

[From the New York American, December 3, 1903.]

STEEL MAGNATES IGNORE WAGE TOPIC—BIG SALARIES TO BE ELIMINATED BY GIANT CORPORATION—AMALGAMATION IS COMPLETED.

PITTSBURG, December 2, 1903.

Although cuts in wages were to have been discussed by the presidents of the subsidiary companies at the conference of the United States Steel Corporation to-day, President Corey, of the corporation, said the subject was not taken up. He has ordered all conferences held in Pittsburgh. His object is to get away from the influence of Wall street. Arrangements were concluded to-day for the amalgamation of the American Tin Plate Company and the American Sheet Steel Company on January 1. The main offices will be removed from New York to this city.

Many of the men drawing big salaries will be discharged January 1. It was given out that each subordinate company will handle its own wage question. The Carnegie company will make a schedule of wages soon and will demand individual agreements with its employees.

JOLIET, December 2, 1903.

A reduction of from 5 to 10 per cent in wages was ordered to-day in all the wire mills of the United States Steel Company, affecting 1,000 men.

[From the Chicago Chronicle, December 4, 1903.]

WIRE WORKERS' WAGES CUT—STEEL TRUST ORDER REACHES WAUKEGAN, AFFECTING HUNDREDS OF MEN.

The order for a cut in wages of employees of the wire mills controlled by the steel trust reached Waukegan yesterday. The cut affects several hundred men. It averages about 12 per cent.

Men who were getting \$60 a month are cut to \$50. The machinists are cut from 31½ cents to 28 cents an hour, the galvanizers' pay reduced from 1 to 3 cents per ton, and the laborers will probably drop from 15 and 17 cents an hour to the old scale of 14½ cents in effect a year ago.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, December 4, 1903.]

STEEL WORKS CLOSE—SHUT-DOWN OF NATIONAL COMPANY'S PLANT AFFECTS 2,500 MEN.

BELLAIRE, OHIO, December 3, 1903.

Twenty-five hundred men were laid off to-day when they reported for work at the plant of the National Steel Company. The works were closed down for an indefinite period on orders from Pittsburgh. No explanation was given for the order.

[From the Johnstown Democrat, December 12, 1903.]

INCOMES OF ALL SALARIED EMPLOYEES OF CAMBRIA COMPANY MAY UNDERGO A PARING—BIG STEEL CORPORATION, IT IS REPORTED, TO FURTHER CUT EXPENSES, WILL JANUARY 1 DECLARE A 10 PER CENT REDUCTION, AFFECTING HUNDREDS.

According to reports the Cambria Steel Company will after the first of the year reduce the wages of all its salaried employees 10 per cent. The rumor to the above effect has been widely circulated throughout the

city. As yet no notice has been posted concerning the matter, but there are almost four weeks remaining before January 1, at which time it is reported that the reduction will go into effect.

As announced exclusively in The Democrat sometime ago, the working hours of most of the employees of the mechanical department of the big steel company have been reduced an average of one hour. This same reduction would of course be welcomed by the salaried men, provided the stipends remained the same. But, to further reduce expenses, it is said that the clerks and other men on salary will after January 1 receive 10 per cent less than heretofore. One official when questioned concerning the report did not deny the rumor, but said that "everything is uncertain these days."

"The wages," he said, "might be reduced at the first of the year; they might be reduced later in 1904 and, again, they might not be reduced at all. No one knows."

The Cambria Company is not hiring any men these days. When a man quits or is discharged the other men in his department, whether it be an office, a shop, or a mill, share the work which he had to do.

SANITARY DAIRY CUT.

The drivers employed by the Sanitary Dairy Company, about thirty in all, have, it is said, had their pay reduced \$5 a month. The rumor could not be verified last night, but according to people in a position to know, it is a fact.

[From the New York American, December 4, 1903.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND MEN THROWN OUT BY THE CASSATT-GOULD WAR—PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD'S RETRENCHMENTS LAY OFF THAT NUMBER OF WORKERS IN THREE MONTHS.

PHILADELPHIA, December 3, 1903.

While Pennsylvania Railroad officials deny that any of their employees have lost their places, and, in fact, assert that there are more men working for them at the present time than during the last eight months, it is estimated that at least 150,000 men have been thrown out of work by the railroad within the past three months.

The great majority of these, of course, are not employed directly by the Pennsylvania Railroad. They are workers for contractors who ceased to be useful when the railroad began its policy of retrenchment on the outbreak of the Cassatt-Gould-Rockefeller war.

Where the employees of the road directly suffered was in the Altoona and Wilmington shops. At the former place more than a thousand men lost their places, and at the latter perhaps half that number. In a number of smaller shops belonging to the railroad a cut of the forces was made, but the big shrinkage was at the two cities named.

All questions concerning the actual number laid off in other departments of the service were met by the statement that the "railroad is not working its full force everywhere."

[From the New York Post, December 5, 1903.]

STEEL TRADE'S NEW WAGE SCALE—WHAT REDUCTIONS ARE EXPECTED AT PITTSBURG—THE CARNEGIE COMPANY.

PITTSBURG, December 5, 1903.

The "wage scale" contracts at the Carnegie Steel Company's plants are nearly terminated, and the basis of readjustment is the main topic of discussion here. It is generally believed that officials of the Carnegie Company had outlined their plans in detail before the arrival of the corporation officials here last Wednesday morning. Privately, it has been stated that the scale as drawn up has been already approved, but the meetings were secret, and nothing was given out for publication.

Among the employees at the great plants at Homestead, Braddock, and Duquesne opinion is general that the reduction will range from 10 to 30 per cent for the skilled workers and about 8 per cent for the day laborers. Office employees are anticipating cuts in their salaries ranging from 10 to 30 per cent, the minimum reduction being based on salaries around \$1,000 to \$1,300 per year. It is said the cut on \$2,500 salaries will be 20 per cent, on \$3,000 25 per cent, and on \$3,500 and over 30 per cent. The official announcement of the proposed reductions will be made about Christmas.

[From Saturday Blade, December 5, 1903.]

MANY WORKERS BEING LAID OFF—THE SLOWING DOWN OF INDUSTRY GOES ON—WAGE REDUCTIONS IN SOME INSTANCES AND SHORTER HOURS IN OTHERS.

With the advent of the first really continuous cold weather in Chicago, this winter, thousands of men were laid off and the time of many others was reduced. The heaviest lay off is with the employees of the International Harvester Company. This huge corporation employs about 8,000 men and women, and more than one-third of these are to be laid off.

At the South Deering branch no warning was given the men. They received their pay and were told that the works would be shut down until further notice. The employees asked for a week's notice, but were told they would have to get employment elsewhere or wait for the reopening next spring.

At the main factories of the Deering division, at Fullerton avenue and the river, the men have been laid off in groups, the total number being more than 1,000. At the McCormick division the men have been dropped in a similar manner.

The reason given by the management for its course is "overproduction." The men's assertion is that the company is cutting down expenses to make up for the increase in wages forced upon it by the unions during the year. Both employer and employee say more men are to be let out, and that 7,000 out of 19,000 working for the combine soon will be idle.

The men working for the company are distributed in the various plants as follows:

McCormick division	7,000
Deering division	7,000
Warder, Bushnell & Glessner	3,000
Milwaukee Harvester Company	1,000
Piano division	1,000
Total	19,000

"The company has decided to change its methods of doing business," said a superintendent. "Each division now works separately, causing unnecessary expense. By laying off men and centralizing the work this can be avoided. A few of those dismissed may be taken back, especially at South Deering."

It is safe to say that the wages of 150,000 workers have been reduced this week, including the 75,000 New England textile employees. This affects all labor, as it reduces the power of these consumers to buy the products of others.

Strikes are reported in some places because of wage reductions, but as a rule the employees submit. Among accounts of labor troubles as well as of reductions in wages reaching this office the following are interesting:

The Dewees wood plant at McKeesport, Pa., was placed in full operation

this week, the men employed in the plate mill having accepted a reduction of 30 per cent. Others will go back to work at smaller reductions which take effect January 1. Over 400 of the employees of the Demmler tinplate works agreed to accept 20 per cent reduction. The 600 employees of the independent tinplate plant at Port Vue have accepted a 20 per cent reduction.

A general order issued by the Cambria Steel Company, Johnstown, Pa., places the single-turn employees on a nine-hour basis. The order affects 13,000 men. The idea of curtailing the working hours of the mechanics, as well as all floating day labor, rather than effecting economies by a shutdown is to preserve the organizations, so that when the busy season arrives the Cambria shops will be effectively manned.

D. Callahan, Charles Fry, Ralph Fry, Reben Wright, Charles Greenslade, A. Schwenn, and Edward Brandt, employees of the Ohio Cultivator Works, at Bellevue, Ohio, were indicted three indictments each—two on a charge of rioting and one on a charge of assault during a recent strike against nonunion employees. All are members of the Moulders' Union. They were arrested, and gave bond.

The new wage schedule adopted by the cotton mills of Rhode Island, which reduces the wages of operatives 10 per cent, went into effect this week. Thirty-seven mills, with 17,000 employees, are affected. The employees are dissatisfied, but will await a more favorable market before pressing for a return to former figures.

Missouri, Kansas and Texas section men at Fort Scott, Kans., struck against a reduction of 15 cents a day in their wages, and it is reported that men all along the line have gone out. Section men on the Frisco and Missouri Pacific roads in Missouri and Kansas have struck against similar reductions.

Employers in three lines of industry in Chicago are reported to be doing away with the unions of their workers. The restaurant keepers and hotel men are hiring nonunion help, and officers of their associations assert that waiters, cooks, and bartenders have disowned their association.

An injunction was issued at Indianapolis, Ind., restraining the striking molders of the Indianapolis Foundry Company from interfering with the men who want to work. The company is resisting the effort to make its shop a union shop.

The Somerset Coal Company, the W. K. Niver Coal Company, and the Merchants' Coal Company, which own and operate a number of mines in the Meyersdale, Pa., region, will reduce miners' wages 10 cents a ton December 16.

Railroads centering in Chicago cut down their forces in the shops last week. Machinists, car workers, blacksmiths, and boiler makers are without work. Two thousand men are out of employment.

Orders were received at Decatur, Ill., at the car department of the Wabash system, to make a reduction of 10 per cent in expenditures for wages. It is stated that 150 men may be laid off.

At a conference in Pittsburg, Pa., between the manufacturers and representatives of the Flint Glass Workers' Union, the wages of the men in two departments were reduced 21 per cent.

On account of a reduction of 12 cents in their wages all the laborers at the Sharon, Pa., tin mill of the United States Steel Corporation struck.

Most of the 200 employees at the United States Zinc and Chemical Company's plant at Argentine, Kans., struck because of a cut in wages.

The dull market for pig iron has caused the Everett, Pa., furnace to be shut down indefinitely. The force of workers will be reduced.

All traction men in the employ of the street-railway company at Marquette, Mich., struck for higher wages.

A strike is threatened by the Indianapolis Butchers' Union because of a refusal to increase wages.

The cigar makers' strike is rapidly spreading in Porto Rico. Thirteen hundred men are out.

[From the Chicago Chronicle, December 6, 1903.]

HUNDREDS LOSE POSITIONS—STEEL CORPORATION REQUIRES RETRENCHMENT IN ALL DEPARTMENTS.

GREENVILLE, Pa., December 5, 1903.

Acting upon the orders of the United States Steel Corporation, retrenchment is being made in all departments of the Bessemer and Lake Erie Railroad. Operators, trainmen, and employees of all classes, to the number of several hundred, have been discharged.

[From the Washington Post.]

INTERNATIONAL MERCANTILE.

A special telegram from correspondents of the International Mercantile Agency throughout the United States and Canada are summarized as follows:

The week is characterized by further slackening industry; by a wholesale and retail Christmas demand which promises to expand the volume of holiday trade beyond that of last year; by an increase in the investment demand for securities; by the appreciation that money will begin to flow eastward by January 1, and by the spreading action on the part of manufacturers looking to reduction of costs of production.

Wages of 200,000 industrial employees have been reduced 10 per cent or more, and preparations are making to effect a similar reduction with respect to 300,000 others in various lines on or about January 1. At Philadelphia cotton and woolen mills are running at about half capacity. Paterson's year has not met expectations. Some eastern shoe factories have turned out less of late. Window-glass factories complain of importations. Paper mills have shut down to offset overproduction in some cases, but in the pottery industry the year has been favorable, and the like is true with respect to coal and fertilizers, while the copper, lumber, and jewelry industries report full average outputs. A striking feature is the starting, from day to day, of establishments which had shut down from various causes, and the increasing number of small orders for iron and steel. Cereals and provisions are weak.

Woolen-goods sales have been extended less than expected. At Philadelphia the volume of dry goods trade for the season is greater than last year. Louisville reports a heavy gain in bank clearings. In cotton sections of the Mississippi Valley trade and collections are good.

In the Dominion of Canada colder weather and snowfalls have stimulated trade in heavy goods. This has broken retail records, and additional orders are going forward freely. Agricultural implement makers are working to full capacity. Lumber trade is in a healthful condition.

[From the Elizabeth Times, December 6, 1903.]

A 10 per cent reduction has gone into effect at the plant of the Passaic Steel Company. The reduced wages will continue in force until the steel market shows signs of brightening. Officials in the managerial departments as well as the entire staff of workmen will be affected. No secret is made of the fact that the steel industry is weak in the entire country, and it is only the plea of the local company that a continuance of the Passaic plant will bring about in a short time the old scale of wages that encourages the men to continue at work. Grand Master Hanrahan, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, and Grand Chief Stone, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, deny that movement is on foot which contemplates the amalgamation of the two organizations.

A number of men have been laid off at the Stephenson Car Works, the

majority of whom were painters. An eight-hour day is now observed by some employees, instead of ten hours as in the past. This is due to a slackness of work at the plant, the big order for the underground subway cars having been almost filled.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, December 7, 1903.]

REDUCED WAGES FOR MINERS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., December 6, 1903.

The committees of the miners in the employ of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company and the Sloss-Sheffield Iron Company yesterday fixed the mining wages for December at 47½ cents per ton, a reduction of 5 cents per ton. This is the minimum wage under the contract. Something like 14,000 men are affected by the reduction.

[From the Washington Star, December 12, 1903.]

EIGHTY THOUSAND AFFECTED SO FAR—15,000 COTTON MILL OPERATIVES GET 10 PER CENT WAGE REDUCTION.

BOSTON, December 7, 1903.

The wages of 15,000 cotton mill operatives were reduced about 10 per cent to-day in New Bedford, Fitchburg, Mass.; Baltic, Taftville, Conn.; Fisherville, Mass., and Pawtucket, R. I.

The total number of mill hands who have had their pay lowered up to the present time is about 80,000.

Five thousand additional operatives in Berkshire County have been given notice that their pay will be cut next week.

Most of the mills which have participated in the cut to date follow the course of the Fall River schedule adopted November 30. Of the operatives affected by to-day's notice about 12,000 are employed in New Bedford.

ACCEPT REDUCED SCALE.

CHESTER, W. VA., December 7, 1903.

The employees of the Chester tin plate mill of the American Tin Plate Company have accepted the reduced scale offered by the company, and the entire plant will start in full January 1.

[From the Johnstown Democrat, December 7, 1903.]

FOURTEEN THOUSAND MINERS AFFECTED BY CUT IN WAGES.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., December 6, 1903.

The committee of the miners in the employ of the Tennessee Coal, Iron and Railroad Company and the Sloss-Sheffield Iron Company yesterday fixed the mining wages for December at 47½ cents a ton, a reduction of 5 cents per ton. This is the minimum wage under the contract. Something like 14,000 men are affected by the reduction.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, December 7, 1903.]

IRON FURNACES OUT OF BLAST.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, December 6, 1903.

J. G. Butler, jr., chairman of the Bessemer Pig Iron Association, said to-day, regarding the output of pig iron, that the blast furnaces tributary to the Lake Superior ore region, with a total daily capacity of 37,000 tons, or a yearly capacity of 14,000,000 tons, show, up to December 1, 65 furnaces in blast, and 91 furnaces out of blast, or an idle capacity of 57 per cent of the whole region.

[From the Boston Transcript, December 7, 1903.]

MORE WAGE CUTS IN EFFECT.

The wages of 15,000 cotton mill operatives were reduced about 10 per cent to-day in New Bedford, Fitchburg, Baltic, Conn., Fisherville, Mass., and Pawtucket, R. I., bringing the total number of mill hands who have had their pay lowered during the present cotton crisis to 80,000. Five thousand additional operatives in Berkshire County have been given notice that their pay will be cut next week. Most of the mills which have participated in the cut to date follow the course of the Fall River schedule.

The cut down in New Bedford affects the Dartmouth, Grinnell, Pierce, Potomaska, Wamsutta, Whitman, and Bristol cloth mills, and the City Manufacturing Company, yarn, all of which employ a total of nearly 12,000 hands when running at their full capacity. The last reduction in New Bedford cloth mills was attended by a prolonged general strike and the closing of all the cloth mills, but this time no serious trouble was apprehended. The New Bedford mills are engaged in the manufacture of fine goods. They have been more or less affected by the unfavorable market conditions, and the operatives decided not to offer open resistance to the cut.

A reduction was also made to-day at the Ponemah Mills of Taftville, Conn. This plant, which is controlled by Rhode Island capital, employed about 1,200 hands. The Baltic Mill has 400 hands, and the Fisherville concern about the same number. The Slater Mills of Pawtucket, R. I., also reduced the wages of its 600 hands to-day, thus completing the general cut in that State. In Fitchburg a reduction was made to-day at the Orswell, Nocke, and Grant mills, all yarn producers, employing about 1,100 operatives. Some of the Fitchburg mills are seriously handicapped by the great cost of cotton. The cut down there is due to the cotton crisis, as is the closing of the Fitchburg Duck Mills. No reduction has been made by the Parkhill Manufacturing Company of that city.

\$10,000 WEEKLY CUT IN NEW BEDFORD.

NEW BEDFORD, December 7, 1903.

The reduction of 10 per cent in wages went into effect this morning in the cloth mills of this city and at the City Mill, the only yarn mill which raised wages two years ago, when the cloth mills did. The New England Cotton Yarn Company did not raise wages at that time, and has not cut now. The cut affects about 12,000 operatives and will take from circulation about \$10,000 a week.

[From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce, Dec. 8, 1903.]

FAILURE OF WHOLESALE DEALER IN FURS—CREDITORS OF EDGAR LEHMAN FILE PETITION IN BANKRUPTCY.

A petition in bankruptcy has been filed against Edgar Leyman, importer and wholesale dealer in furs and skins at 163 Mercer and 43 East Twelfth streets, by the following creditors: Joseph Ullmann, \$5,000; Ciniotti Unhairing Co., \$1,115; and Mantner & Ahlswede, \$7,500. It was alleged that he is insolvent and on December 5 admitted in writing his inability to pay his debts and willingness to be adjudged bankrupt. Judge Holt, of the United States district court, appointed Peter Alexander receiver of the assets, fixing his bond at \$100,000. It was stated in the application for the receiver that the assets amount to more than \$200,000 in merchandise accounts and cash in bank.

Mr. Lehman has been in business since 1885, and built up a large trade. In February last his statement showed assets of \$363,000 and liabilities \$187,000. He also had real estate in this city, Bayswater and Far Rockaway,

on which the equity was placed at \$65,000. The failure caused much surprise in trade circles. James Schell & Elkus, attorneys for the petitioning creditors, said that the liabilities are about \$400,000, in addition to which there are some contingent liabilities, probably \$25,000 to \$50,000. The assets are not definitely known, but he has a large stock of furs on hand, accounts, and real estate, all of which has been turned over to the receiver.

The trouble is attributed to depreciation in the price of furs. He carried a large and costly stock of sables, foxes, etc., and on account of the stringency in the money market and depression in financial circles he could not find purchasers for his goods. He expects to call a meeting of creditors and offer a settlement.

LOWER WAGES IN COTTON MILLS—ABOUT 80,000 WORKERS SO FAR AFFECTED IN NEW ENGLAND.

BOSTON, December 7, 1903.

The wages of 15,000 cotton-mill operatives were reduced about 10 per cent to-day in New Bedford, Fitchburg, Baltic, Conn.; Taftville, Conn.; Fisherville, Mass., and Pawtucket, R. I. The total number of mill hands who have had their pay lowered during the present cotton crisis is now about 80,000. Five thousand additional operatives in Berkshire County have been given notice that their pay will be cut next week. Most of the mills which have participated in the cut to date follow the course of the Fall River schedule adopted November 30. Of the operatives affected by to-day's notice, about 12,000 are employed in New Bedford.

NORWICH, CONN., December 7, 1903.

Notice of a 10 per cent reduction in wages, to take effect December 14, were posted to-day in the mills of the Shetucket and Fall companies. These mills employ 1,300 hands. At the Ballou, Attawagan, and Teteoket mills, employing 2,500 operatives, a 10 per cent reduction went into effect to-day.

KNITTING COMPANY STOPS OPERATIONS.

COHOES, N. Y., December 5, 1903.

The Hope Knitting Company suspended operations during the week owing to the breaking of a shaft. Operations will be resumed immediately upon repairs being completed.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one hour and twenty-two minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the House's attention to the bill under consideration. Heretofore we have heard some very excellent addresses on other lines, some speeches along the line of tariff reform and along the lines of active political questions that in the later days of this year we will all be engaged in discussing pro and con. The bill that is under consideration now is one providing for the military establishment of the Government. What does the military branch of the Government consist of to-day? It is made up of 55,500 enlisted men and 3,681 officers. That constitutes the military force of our Government. This force has to be kept up each year on account of the expiration of the terms of enlistment of the men in the service.

We find that in the year that has passed 54,253 applicants to enter into the service of the Government as private soldiers were rejected; 17,714 in addition to that number were accepted as soldiers in the Army. Eighty-one per cent of those who applied to enter the service of the Government were rejected upon various grounds. I desire to call the attention of the committee and the country to the fact that the recruiting officers of the Government are extremely careful in getting into the service men of character, of ability, and of standing, and are seeking to get the highest class of men in the service of the Government.

I am pleased to state to this general committee, as a member of the Military Committee, that the personnel of the American Army is equal to, if not superior to, that of any army in the world; and it is right that it should be so, because these men in a military sense represent the honor and the dignity of the great American Republic. Now, these men are officered by 3,681 officers. From whence do these officers come? They likewise come from the body of the people. Here are 386 Members in this House, and 90 Senators in the other branch. Under the law we have the right to name young men as cadets to West Point. We select one from each of our respective districts. They come from the body of the people, and to that extent they represent the great democracy of the American Republic; but I find upon reading in this report that we do not get enough officers as graduates of West Point to meet the requirements of the Army.

In the last year there were appointed to the grade of second lieutenant in the Army 177 men; 83 of these were graduates of West Point; 44 were enlisted men who came from private soldiers in the United States Army. Then there was added to that number 56 civilians. The door to preference and distinction along the line of military service is not closed to the deserving man. We can only appoint so many to West Point. The graduates of that institution can not meet the requirements of the Army, and then the Army turns to the deserving young man of ability, of intelligence, and of character, and says to him, "Come forward, if you possess the qualities necessary to make an officer in the American Army;" and I am pleased to say that the Lieutenant-General who

has recently retired from the Army came from the ranks as a private soldier, and the door was open by which he could reach the high distinction as commanding officer of the American Army. I am also informed and know the truth to be that the man who now wears the stars as Lieutenant-General of the Army is another man who came from the volunteer service, from the ranks of the American soldiery.

With such an army as this, officered by such men, we can safely trust the affairs of the Republic in their hands. But in these days in which we are now living there is much criticism and carping with reference to the promotion that comes to these men in the line in the Army. According to the limitations placed by law, from second lieutenant up to and including the colonel, they move along in seniority of rank. Nearly 4,000 officers stand there marking time, one following another, according to seniority in rank, each one taking the next higher grade, from the position of second lieutenant up to and including the colonel of the regiment. But beyond that there are twenty-two general officers. These men have the command and the control of the armies of the United States. By the organic law of our country the President of the United States is made Commander in Chief. The people put him in by their vote and hold him responsible for the conduct and management of the Army of this country. As I have said, up to and including the colonel the men are appointed by seniority of rank. Twenty-two general officers, one a major-general acting as Lieutenant-General, and a number of major-generals and a number of brigadier-generals form the general officers of the Government, and are promoted and appointed by the President of the United States.

There has been some criticism along certain lines that this executive officer, clothed with the responsibility of looking after the affairs of the military branch of the Government, has seen fit to walk down the line of these 3,861 men and say to this young man or to that young man of ability, who has kept abreast of the times, who knows what is going on in this country and in the world with reference to military affairs, "Step outside here and I will make of you a brigadier-general of the Army." Why should he not have that power? Somebody must exercise it. The Constitution places it upon him, and, as it seems to me, he better than anyone else can exercise that power, and exercise it well. If he should see fit to abuse that power, if he should see fit to do what the judgment of the country says is not the proper thing wisely by the Constitution of the United States, a part of the coordinate branch of the Government, with ninety Senators sitting there representing the sovereign States of the Union with equal power with him, would not confirm that officer for the position. It seems to me that the power of selection is wisely intrusted with the Chief Executive of the country.

Now, this bill that we have under consideration makes provision for this Army, made up, as I have said, of over 55,000 enlisted men and nearly 4,000 officers to command these men. We are appropriating more than \$75,000,000 for this Army. We should appropriate liberally for them, and I am glad to say that in the Military Committee, made up as it is by men on both sides of this House, we have given careful consideration to every item which enters into the formation of this bill. It has been gone over carefully and considerably, and now it is presented to this House for approval or rejection.

I am pleased to state also that in the deliberations of the committee—not disclosing them—we act, as we should act, for the interest of the American people. In my judgment there should be no politics in the Army or in the Navy. They stand for the whole people as a branch of the Government, and in the discussion of questions of this kind I have observed, in the years that I have served here, that the Army is ceasing to be a political question, and the discussion of estimates for the Army or the pay for the same has been left out in the later years of political discussion, and that the committee stand here and elsewhere as now, as representatives of the people, considering the American question, uniting in making wise and suitable and decent provision for the benefit of the Army, of which we are so proud as citizens of this great Republic. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution No. 37.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of New Meadows River, Maine, with a view to its improvement from the head of navigation to deep water in Casco Bay.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, availing myself of the wide latitude given in debate in Committee of the Whole, I wish to speak for a time upon the tariff question. In 1888, with a surplus in the Treasury, it became necessary to revise the tariff laws to reduce that surplus, and the only question between the two political parties was as to the method of reduction. For a generation, at that time, there had been no serious controversy upon the doctrine of protection. The amount of revenue necessary to pay the pensions, the debts contracted during the war, and the expenses of the Government rendered the existing duties high enough to make ample protection of American industry.

PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE—FREE TRADE WITH CANADA—TRUE RECIPROCITY.

At the beginning of our Government the question of protection to American industries arose and has been more or less in controversy ever since.

The civil war sidetracked this issue from 1861 to 1888, during which time the question of protection or free trade was but little discussed, though in the interval the tariff was revised. The revisions, however, proceeded along most pronounced protective lines, but in 1888 the national campaign was fought upon the tariff issue.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1888.

Mr. Cleveland stood for a reversal of our protective policy, whilst General Harrison was a candidate of the party of protection. Mr. Cleveland demanded revision on Democratic lines. The platform of the Republican party was presented to the national convention by Major McKinley, then a rising man, but only in the beginning of his national fame. When McKinley read the tariff plank to the national convention at Chicago, the rafters shook with applause. It said:

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRIES.

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily indorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

On the issue thus clearly presented the party of protection won.

The whole subject of free trade was discussed upon elementary principles, and, old as the arguments were, they were new to the generation that had grown up under Republican rule.

The tariff was revised along protective lines by McKinley himself, but in 1892 the battle was renewed. Mr. Cleveland again was the free-trade leader, and his platform was practically a reiteration of the language of the constitution of the late Confederate States of America.

CONFEDERATE CONSTITUTION.

That constitution provided:

No bounty shall be granted from the Treasury and no duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations shall be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

And the Democratic platform in 1892 alleged in terms that the Constitution of the United States also forbade the levy of protective duties.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM OF 1892.

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few. We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of the laboring man to one increase. We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real-estate mortgage debt of over two thousand five hundred million dollars exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real-estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of sheriff.

The McKinley bill was condemned, unheard and untried, in the Congressional election of 1890. That law had then only been in force a single month. Its terms were imperfectly understood by the voters, and its effects were still a matter of conjecture. Denunciation of its purposes were accepted as proofs, and prophecies as to its consequences were accepted as facts. The result was

that only a corporal's guard of the Members who voted for that law were returned to Congress that year.

In the State of Iowa, out of our eleven Members six were Democratic free traders in the Fifty-second Congress; but by the next election, in 1892, the McKinley law had had a two years' trial. The country was prosperous. Our exports for the first time in our history had passed the billion-dollar mark, and our balance of trade was more than \$200,000,000 on the right side of the ledger. The Republican declaration of its tariff principles was clear and strong.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1892.

We reaffirm the American doctrine of protection. We call attention to its growth abroad. We maintain that the prosperous condition of our country is largely due to the wise revenue legislation of the last Republican Congress. We believe that all articles which can not be produced in the United States, except luxuries, should be admitted free of duty, and that on all imports coming into competition with the products of American labor there should be levied duties equal to the difference between wages abroad and at home.

We assert that the prices of manufactured articles of general consumption have been reduced under the operations of the tariff act of 1890.

We denounce the efforts of the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives to destroy our tariff laws by piecemeal as manifested by their attacks upon wool, lead, and lead ores, the chief products of a number of States, and we ask the people for their judgment thereon.

We point to the success of the Republican policy of reciprocity, under which our export trade has vastly increased and new and enlarged markets have been opened for the products of our farms and workshops. We remind the people of the bitter opposition of the Democratic party to this practical business measure, and claim that, executed by a Republican Administration, our present laws will eventually give us control of the trade of the world.

IS IT WISE TO LET WELL ENOUGH ALONE?

The Republican campaign maxim in 1892 was founded upon very satisfactory existing conditions. The people were very prosperous, labor was employed, business steadily increasing, and the slogan of the party of protection was then voiced in four words, "Let well enough alone!" Our Democratic opponents raised the battle cry, "Let us have a change!" If we insisted that we were "doing well enough," the answer was to the effect, "Then quit it." If we answered that we were "prosperous and in a sound, safe, and secure condition," the answer was, "Move on; never stand still."

The demand for "a change, constant change," was asserted with great force in every part of the country. We had a change. We moved out of 1892 into 1893. We passed from the light into outer darkness. What the people wanted was a change of rulers and a change of laws, coupled with the retention of existing good conditions. We got the change of rulers and the change of laws. This change they thought they wanted. They got also a change of conditions; a thing they did not want. They could at least say that they were not standing still; they were moving, but they were moving downhill. The country remembers these conditions. It can not easily forget them. But our adversity remained until the people once more returned to protection and declared for the gold standard and sound money. The law was changed, and the conditions responded with good cheer.

In 1896 our Democratic opponents did not have the heart to resume their assaults on the protective policy. Those four years were exceptionally calamitous to the farmer. It was thought that by the adoption of the Wilson law, though we might lose somewhat on our home market, our exports would greatly increase so far as agricultural products were concerned. We threw away our great home market for the markets of the world. But the markets of the world did not respond. The Des Moines (Iowa) Register, a sterling protection newspaper, prepared from official sources a report of the loss of the farmers during those four years, which I will here insert in my remarks:

Four years' loss on farm crops.

Loss on farm animals	\$2,560,422,968
Loss on wheat crops	300,832,581
Loss on corn crops	363,725,658
Loss on oat crops	138,481,331
Loss on hay crops, three years	464,739,066
Loss on potato crops, three years	83,291,365
Loss on barley crops, three years	7,250,877
Loss on cotton crops	221,803,355
Loss on wool crops	111,272,023
Loss on tobacco crops, three years	29,873,517
Loss on rye crops, two years	1,894,142
Loss on buckwheat crops, two years	172,137

Total loss on four years' crops..... 4,233,737,520

It will be noticed that the losses on hay, potato, barley, and tobacco crops are only for three years—1894, 1895, and 1896—the official report stating in each instance that no statistics were gathered in 1892; therefore we were compelled to make the comparison with 1893. The total loss on the hay, potato, barley, and tobacco crops aggregated \$555,154,325, and taking one-third for the decrease in 1893 from 1892 would add \$195,051,441 to the aggregate losses on farm crops.

Besides, we have been unable to obtain details of the losses on skins and hides, hemp, flax, jute, vegetables—among which the value of beans and peas exported decreased \$1,563,486—broom corn, fruits, hops, rice, tallow, butter—on which the value of exports decreased \$2,923,538—lard, poultry, eggs, and cheese—on which the value of the exports decreased \$6,002,993. It is probable that if we were able to obtain the full official figures showing the loss on every farm product, the aggregate loss during the four years would exceed over \$5,000,000,000, as still further indicated by the following official statistics, giving the annual loss in the value of the exports of farm products during

the four years, taken from page 596 of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1896.

Loss on farm products—Exports.

Year.	Total exports.	Decrease from 1892.
1892	\$799,328,272	
1893	615,382,986	\$183,945,286
1894	628,303,038	170,965,194
1895	553,210,023	246,118,256
1896	571,899,845	228,428,387
Total loss on 4 years' exports		\$829,457,033

Instead of the farmer's products being exported in an increased volume, as compared with the period of the McKinley Act in 1892, the four years showed the remarkable falling off of more than \$800,000,000. We threw away our home market and went skimming for the "markets of the world." We threw away the substance for the shadow. We found it a decreasing and illusive shadow.

In 1896 our opponents declared for free silver as the "paramount issue." In 1900 the free-silver plank was still on the stage, but the calcium light was turned upon "anti-expansion" and "anti-imperialism," which were declared "paramount."

If the tariff was incidentally discussed in 1896 and 1900, the debate did not go back to the elementary doctrines of the subject. Too recent events had made the issue a plain one of demonstrated fact. The repeal of the McKinley law was remembered with regret, and the Wilson law was looked upon with deep and profound disgust. Those "Democratic times" will be long remembered.

The Democracy surrendered back their ill-used power in 1897, and the Republicans settled the money question by adopting the gold standard, and the tariff question by passing the Dingley law.

For six years these twin policies have been in successful operation. The ills now complained of are those which are the products of prosperous times. Increased capital and wealth have been accompanied by combinations which have been declared illegal by law. The present Administration is more vigorously enforcing laws against trusts and combinations than has any of its predecessors. The solution of the trust question is not to destroy capital, but to control its operations.

FREE TRADE WITH CANADA.

Under the McKinley law a number of reciprocity treaties were made which produced great benefit to our people and without injury to the countries with which they were made.

The Wilson bill swept them away in a moment.

The Republican party has declared in favor of reciprocity and has made some advancement along that line. But in matters of this kind the nations with which we deal all want the best possible terms, and most usually terms that can not be wisely conceded.

Republicans are heartily in favor of reciprocity, but they want it of the kind that will reciprocate.

It might be possible to draw a treaty with our neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, which would be beneficial to both nations, but it has never yet been possible to do so upon terms which would be just to ourselves. The difficulty about reciprocity with the people of the Dominion of Canada is that they are producers of the same things that we are. They are our rivals and competitors.

From 1855 to 1866 we had a treaty providing for free trade between the United States and Canada in the "natural resources of both countries."

This treaty was ratified with much gratification and in the hopes that it would be of great mutual advantage. When we consider the schedule of "natural products" we can readily see the inequality of such a bargain. The articles admitted free were "breadstuffs, meats, fish, raw cotton, vegetables, fruits, poultry, eggs, hides, furs, skins, stone, dairy products, ores, fertilizers, lumber, wood, flax, hemp, tow, and unmanufactured tobacco."

As Canada could raise neither cotton nor tobacco, the raw material necessary to her cotton and tobacco factories was a matter of necessity to her, and the other articles were competing products in which she had the advantage.

The civil war intervened and made it somewhat difficult to determine the merits of the agreement, but in the last year and nine months of that treaty, in 1865 and 1866, we remitted duties to Canada amounting to \$70,152,163, and the balance of trade was against us in the same year and nine months in the sum of \$28,134,749.

The Canadians are a thrifty people and in possession of a vast domain. They have by pelagic sealing killed off nearly all the great seal herd which we supposed we had obtained by our purchase of Alaska. They ruthlessly slaughtered the mothers of this herd out at sea, allowing their helpless offspring to starve in the rookeries on the American islands.

Any treaty that we make with them hereafter should provide means to save the remaining seals from utter extermination.

Their preposterous claims to the ownership of Skagway, Dyea, and the Lynn Canal in Alaska were asserted with such apparent earnestness that an arbitration was required to clear up a title which had never been disputed as against either Russia or the United States until the discovery of the Klondike gold caused the necessity for an elastic boundary sufficient to include a Canadian seaport. Some ill feeling is manifested by our neighbors over the defeat of this wholly unfounded claim by the high court of arbitration. Flimsy as their claims were, the Canadian arbitrators insisted upon their pretensions to the last.

This proceeding is so recent as to make it doubtful about obtaining any reasonable treaty of reciprocity with Canada in the present state of mind of the Dominion government.

At this juncture it is proposed to solve the question by the simple method of free and unrestricted trade with Canada. We have about 80,000,000 of people, she has about 5,500,000. It is proposed to furnish Canada 80,000,000 of the best customers in the world in free and equal exchange for the trade of 5,500,000 of people.

There are fifteen persons in the United States to one in Canada. The people make the markets.

Therefore the reciprocal treaty we are asked to undertake is not exactly a ratio of 16 to 1, but 15 to 1. We are asked to trade the certainty of fifteen good customers for the chances of one—one certainly no better, if as good. Besides, that one customer produces nothing that we can not produce ourselves. Such an agreement would no doubt put our neighbors in a better humor than they are at present. The Wilson law was popular in Canada.

In the last Canadian fiscal year ending August 31, 1903, Canada sold us goods to the amount of \$71,209,969. During the same period we sold Canada, including raw cotton, unmanufactured tobacco, and other raw materials for manufacture, to the amount of \$144,764,375.

Under reciprocity in natural products the balance of trade was against us over \$30,000,000 a year at the close of the period when that treaty was in operation. Under present conditions, with a tariff in both countries, our balance of trade is more than \$70,000,000 in our favor. To renew the old arrangement of free trade in natural products, we would again give our neighbor our vast market in equal exchange for a much smaller one at the expense of the American farmers.

It is assumed that Iowa farmers would grow enthusiastic over the proposition to turn over to Canada the market that American farmers now occupy and in exchange for the same to give special advantages to some American manufacturers.

Canada already gives a reduction of 33½ per cent on her tariff duties in favor of the mother country.

What product of Iowa farmers will be sold in Canada under the proposed arrangement? When we make an agreement with Canada the burden should not be all thrown upon the farmers' products, as is proposed by the scheme of "free trade in natural products."

Should free trade in competitive articles be agreed upon as against our farmers, a policy of reciprocity which the Republican party has never looked upon with favor, the articles to be affected should also include the things which the manufacturers are also engaged in producing. The burden should not be borne alone by the farmers. Manufacturers in New England and agriculturals implement manufacturers in the Central West should not insist upon sacrificing the interests of the farmers in order to build up their own trade.

The farmers of the West have favored and do favor protection. They believed in it because it has built up a home market, and because, under protection, that home market was preserved to them. They believed in it because that market was greatly increased. The consumption of their products by the employed workmen in the protected industries furnishes them a great pecuniary interest in the doctrine of protection.

It is now seriously proposed to turn a large part of this advantage over to Canada in consideration of concessions by Canada on manufactured goods.

If we should have free trade with Canada because she is a good customer, we have still stronger reason for free trade with Great Britain, and certainly he must be strong in the Cobden faith who would be willing to expose our manufacturers to a peril like that.

The leather-goods manufacturer wants protected leather goods and free hides.

The agricultural-implement dealer wishes to increase his Canadian trade by surrendering the duties on the farmers' products. Like Artemus Ward, who was "willing to send all his wife's relatives to the war to put down the rebellion," some of these shortsighted dealers are willing to give away the advantages of protection so far as they inure to other occupations than their own.

I do not desire to condemn reciprocity with Canada or any other country with which we can make a fair trade, but the proposition

to surrender the rights of the farmers of Iowa in order to help some other class of our people has not one of the elements of Republican reciprocity. As the farmer has more than once saved the policy of protection by his vote, he has the right to be fairly considered in the making of schedules and treaties affecting his interests.

The old Canadian reciprocity treaty, made in the Democratic days of Pierce and Buchanan, is well described by Mr. Blaine in chapter 27 of his Twenty Years in Congress:

The selection of [commodities], as shown in the schedule, shows that there was scarcely a product on the list which could be exported from the United States without a loss to us, while the great market of the United States was thrown open to Canada without tax or charge for nearly everything which she could produce or export. All her raw materials were admitted free, while our manufactures were all charged heavy duty, the market being reserved for English merchants. The fishery question had been used adroitly to secure from the United States an agreement which was one-sided, vexatious, and unprofitable."

The present situation is even more unfavorable in this, that Great Britain has a rebate of 33½ per cent on all her duties on goods imported into Canada. The imports to Canada from the United States in the fiscal year 1902-3 amounted to \$144,764,375, whilst those of Great Britain amounted to \$85,408,020, notwithstanding the advantages accorded to the Empire.

Blaine's reciprocity has been defined by Hon. Charles Emory Smith as follows:

Brazil grows coffee and makes no machinery. We make machinery and grow no coffee. We agree to concessions for her coffee and she agrees to concessions for our machinery. That is reciprocity.

That was not the kind of reciprocity that was provided for by the Democratic treaty of 1854, but was the Buchanan idea of the subject.

McKinley's Buffalo speech has been grievously misquoted. He in that speech defined reciprocity as "sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production."

Reciprocity has been defined by Mr. Roosevelt as "the handmaiden of protection." It should not be made the sexton of our industries. When we hear of free traders agitating reciprocity, we may know it is not of the "handmaiden" variety.

They propose to throw down the bars to our sister nation and allow her to have an equal trade with the United States, with its enormous and valuable markets. I wish to read in this connection from the Chicago Live Stock World of the day before yesterday:

BAD BREAK IN SHEEP.

The sheep market is up to its old tricks again. A break reaching as much as half a dollar in some cases has occurred within a few days. It was unexpected, but the causes are not hard to locate. Last week's heavy supply started the downward movement. It enabled packers to fill their coolers and relieve them of the necessity of making orders urgent. Yesterday Canada butted in, sending 125 double decks to Buffalo. To-day it repeated with 70 doubles, and prices all over the country tumbled. If Canada can do this and pay a heavy duty, what could she accomplish with the duty removed?

But the suggestion is to "move on," not to "let well enough alone," but let us "open up the doors to Canada." While I am speaking of sheep, that reminds me of the effect of the Wilson-Gorman bill, when we placed our friends upon the other side for the first time in a generation in the uncontrolled management of the affairs of the House, of the Senate, and of the Executive offices. Sheep were their favorite aversion. John Randolph of Roanoke said that he would walk a mile any time to kick a sheep. The effect of the Wilson bill upon that single industry is fresh to-day in the memory of every sheep grower in the United States.

I know in the campaign of 1894, when I was speaking in one of the principal sheep-growing counties of Iowa, some one arose and invited the audience present to come down to another town, the little town of Monterey, in Davis County, Iowa, close to the Missouri line, to a barbecue. A gentleman arose in the audience and said: "What are you going to have to feed us with?" The man answered: "We are going to kill a dollar and a half's worth of sheep; all of you come down." And the audience of 1,500 announced their willingness to go. Now, that was rather a gloomy joke, but the sheep-growing farmers of that day fully appreciated the statement.

The Boston Free Trade League is engaged in an agitation for treaties extending the free list to "all agricultural products any portion of which we now export."

"Beware of Greeks bearing gifts." The kind of reciprocity which meets the views of this league should be eyed askance by all protectionists.

In the national Republican platform of 1900 we say:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity so directed as to open our markets in favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Secretary Wilson, in one of his recent speeches, said:

Reciprocity may become the auxiliary of protection or it may become the assassin of that policy by admitting to our markets what we do produce which needs protection for the purpose of getting new markets for some of our products that we no longer require.

In 1892 the importers in the city of New York contributed liberally to the campaign fund for the election of Mr. Cleveland.

They wanted to import as many goods as possible. They soon learned that an impoverished people and unemployed workmen would furnish a poor market even for the importers. Several of our Democratic friends in this House have already spoken in favor of Canadian free trade.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] has given us an interesting exposition of his view of Canadian reciprocity. He evidently imagines that the disadvantage of the proposed free trade in natural products between the two countries will help Minneapolis and St. Paul more than it will hurt the farmers of his State. Minneapolis and St. Paul are much more interested in the prosperity of Minnesota than they are in the welfare of Manitoba.

I remember quite well when the gentleman from Minnesota, in the Fifty-first Congress, as a Member of this House, voted for the McKinley bill. He has changed his views upon this question, and we are sorry to lose him from the Republican ranks, but I much prefer to hear him speak in favor of free trade from the Democratic side of the Chamber than upon our own.

We can not afford to trifle with the prosperity of the American farmer in the hope of building up American cities.

Canada is not asking us for free trade, nor even pressing a reciprocity treaty.

Mr. Charlton, M. P., said at the Detroit reciprocity convention, December 10, 1902:

The call is with the United States. Canada has definitely and deliberately retired from taking the initiative. (Canadian Annual Review, 1902, page 183.)

That convention finally resolved "to remove all duties from the natural products of each country."

Free trade with Canada, it is said, will Americanize the Dominion. The Canadian Annual for 1902 says there is no danger of such a result, and further reports that 70 per cent of the immigrants from the United States have become the naturalized subjects of King Edward. We may well rejoice at the growth and prosperity of our neighbor, but in framing our tariff laws the interests of the United States are of our first concern.

Reciprocity is easy in the theory but difficult in practice. It takes two to make a bargain. Such a treaty must first run the gauntlet of diplomacy, after which it encounters the endless chain of debate in the American Senate. Reciprocity is recognized as a cardinal principle of the Republican faith. The first question to be discussed from the Republican standpoint is whether the terms of a proposed treaty are desirable.

The question of protection in its operation must depend wholly upon schedules, whether provided for in treaty or by law. If a tariff bill is called a protective measure and the schedules are so arranged as to give inadequate preference to our own products, it will be just as detrimental as though it were called a free-trade measure. All protective propositions, therefore, resolve themselves down to the single question of schedules. It has often been said that "schedules are not sacred." No one has ever claimed that they are. They are always subject to change, and they should be changed whenever a change is necessary for the welfare of the country.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] says that Chamberlain will win in Great Britain. If he wins, it will be because our English kin across the ocean regarded it as wise to profit by the example of the people of the United States. Nothing that we can do or say here will either cause or prevent the success of Mr. Chamberlain. Englishmen to-day are fighting the battle that we fought in 1888 and 1892, the battle that we once more fought in 1896, and every probability points in the direction of the adoption of some form of protection in the one country that to-day supports the doctrine of free trade.

In making a reciprocal treaty with our friends over in the Dominion of Canada we must remember that they have always been first-class traders, and in every contract up to the present date the advantage has been on their side.

Mr. LIND. Would a question embarrass the gentleman at this time?

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman from Iowa kindly state some contract of reciprocal relation with Canada in which they have had the better of the bargain?

Mr. LACEY. My friend has only just come into the Chamber. I have gone over the period in which we had reciprocity with them, and it was a jug-handle reciprocity in natural products.

Mr. LIND. But our trade grew as well as theirs during that period.

Mr. LACEY. Certainly it did. It still grows, and grows a good deal faster under the existing conditions, three times faster than it did under the reciprocal treaty.

Mr. LIND. If the gentleman will permit me. Our relations with Canada are purely on reciprocal basis in regard to canals and in regard to shipments in bond.

Mr. LACEY. Oh, certainly.

Mr. LIND. There is nothing unequal in relation to that.

Mr. LACEY. They are absolutely equal, perhaps. To allow either country to ship goods through a canal in bond or to ship by rail in bond through either country is not at all analogous to the proposition involved in a discussion of the tariff laws of the two countries.

Mr. HULL. That does not make any change in the markets at all?

Mr. LACEY. Not at all.

Mr. LIND. The gentleman has said that they always insisted upon unequal terms, and that is not true. We had the use of their canals free when we were building our canal?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. Their locks, I mean.

Mr. LACEY. That is not a question, however, of tariff. It is a mere question of transportation. It is true they allow us to ship goods from Chicago to New York over the Grand Trunk through Canada rather than on the south side of the Lakes through the United States. That sort of trade is for their benefit rather than ours.

But, as I was saying, such a mutual arrangement as that is like swapping twenty-dollar gold pieces. It has no bearing upon the proposition of our friends on the other side, of free trade with Canada in competitive products. The Detroit convention, which the gentleman who has just interrupted me attended, and in which he made one of his incomparable speeches to the great satisfaction of every Canadian that was present—whether to the satisfaction of all the people in his own State present or not I will not say—

Mr. LIND. I will say it was to the satisfaction of 15,000 Republicans in Minneapolis.

Mr. LACEY. That leads me to refer to another proposition. Many gentlemen in Minneapolis and St. Paul make the same mistake that the importers made in New York in 1892. They propose to give away the Minnesota and Dakota and Iowa farmer's business and cater to Assiniboia and Manitoba. They propose to give away that which belongs to the farmers around them in the hope of widening and enlarging their own trade.

Now, there is no question but what that may be popular among some gentlemen in the city of Minneapolis—men who pose as Republicans, who are willing to trade off everything not their own for something to their own advantage. The farmers have been true to protection in the United States. More than once—yes, many, many times—has the whole principle of protection been dependent upon their votes.

They, in the silence of their homes and in the quiet of their firesides, have studied the question and have realized the fact that it is necessary to have the home market in order to receive remunerative prices. In 1892 some of them were misled by the cry that they could buy their goods abroad and at the same time retain all the advantages that they have at home.

The markets of the world were held up as a "will-o'-the-wisp," and that "will-o'-the-wisp" was called a "beacon light" by which the American people could steer, but soon the people found that they could not take away the occupation of American workmen and have a home market that was worth anything to the producers of food in the United States.

And I will venture to say that my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], when he goes back to his people this fall and discusses the question in that splendid, great north State, will not be able to satisfy the farmers, at least, whatever the millers may think, and whatever the transportation lines owning roads out in the Canadian northwest territory may think. He will not convince the farmers of Minnesota that their markets should be traded off for the advantages which are to inure wholly to somebody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. I will yield ten minutes more to the gentleman from Iowa, or fifteen minutes if he so desires.

Mr. LACEY. Ten minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for ten minutes more.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question at that point.

Mr. LACEY. Very well.

Mr. LIND. What markets of the Minnesota farmers or the Iowa farmers would be jeopardized?

Mr. LACEY. That is a very easy question. Along our northern borders, with the Great Lakes and the facilities of rail transportation as well as water, lie Chicago and Buffalo and Toledo and Cleveland, and all of that splendid array of manufacturing and commercial cities, all to-day drawing the principal portion of their food supply from the agricultural producers of the United States.

The people of the whole Atlantic coast, who also obtain their supplies of fish largely from the fishermen of New England, would find themselves supplied much more easily by people outside of the United States. Our first duty is to America, and when I say America I mean the United States of America.

Canada is a great country, a country of wonderful possibilities. It is said that thousands of our citizens are going there and therefore we should enact legislation that will encourage thousands more of our best blood to go across the line and accept allegiance to King Edward. It has been said, however, that these men who go across the line will Americanize Canada. Not so. They and their interests will alike become Canadian.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] this afternoon insisted that under existing conditions it was impossible to prepare a tariff which would not give sufficient protection. On the contrary, it would be perfectly easy to do so. We could put a duty upon things which we do not produce, such as tea, coffee, and all of those imports of articles that are not the product of the United States. By placing the principal burden upon those things we can not produce and laying no duties or light duties on those things we do produce the tariff would afford no protection to our own producers.

And that I understand, after all, to be the true Democratic doctrine. If it is not, I would be glad to be interrupted by some of our friends on the other side with the information that such is not the present view of that party. That party has always stood for schedules so adjusted as to raise revenue without protection. In the platform of 1892 it was declared in terms that protection was unconstitutional.

TARIFF REVISION.

Since 1892 the declaration that protection is unconstitutional has not been made, and the genial leader on the other side has tended in all his recent speeches to tone down the Democratic doctrine and sugar coat and sweeten it so that the workmen of the United States may mistakenly swallow it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the experience of the people on this subject is recent. Their struggle with the Wilson bill occurred only a few years ago. It has only been about six years since that calamitous statute was taken from the statute books. But it is said that we ought to revise the tariff now. If I had no better reason for thinking that we ought not to tinker with the tariff now, it would be the fact that our opponents want us to do it. When we find out what they want, it is safe not to do it.

On the threshold of a great national campaign to cast into the scale all of the doubts and elements of uncertainty involved in a general tariff revision would be in the nature of political suicide. No wise party ever would think of doing anything of the kind.

When one tariff schedule is revised, that destroys the equilibrium, and some one else wants the tariff on his goods accordingly raised. We know that the election of 1892, as soon as it became certain that the Democratic party had won, brought about a terrific industrial panic.

In the latter part of February, 1893, Senator Roach, of North Dakota, was elected to the Senate of the United States by a combination of Democrats, Republicans, and Populists. That gave to our opponents a majority of one in the Senate of the United States. It was not until the Senatorial election in that State that it became certain that the free traders would be able to control both the Senate and House. They already had the President, and they had elected him on a tariff issue alone. So that when the election in North Dakota gave a majority in the Senate then the trouble began.

When it became certain that the tariff would be revised along these dangerous lines, then the industrial panic came, for the simple reason that every man engaged in the manufacture of protected goods thought it the part of wisdom to wait and see what would happen to him and what would happen to the tariff schedules under which he was working before he continued his production, and therefore there was a general cessation all along the line, the stopping of one industry after another, and the march of Coxey's army of the unemployed to the capital of the nation began.

The people of this country have not forgotten that. When they do forget it, they will then perhaps once more try the experiment of turning down good conditions, of turning their backs upon the time-honored principle of letting well enough alone. They thought in 1892 that they could revise the tariff and change the rulers of the country and change its policies and still stay on the industrial high plane where they were placed during the existence of the McKinley law. They soon found that they could not change the policies of this country without suffering the consequences, and the workmen of the United States will, while this generation exists, remember that lesson.

The Dingley law was enacted in the well-grounded hope and expectation that it would produce a change. The hoped-for change came, and has remained for more than six years. If there are to be changes in that law, in order to meet changed conditions, only changes should be made which will redound to the retention or promotion of our prosperity. But upon the question of tariff revision, prudence and conservatism are of the first importance.

No material modification can be made without at least tempo-

rarily interfering with domestic production, and therefore the Republican party has heretofore only taken up the subject of revision in cases where the necessity was real.

The heat of a great political contest has always a disturbing influence upon the general business of the country. By adding to such contest an assault upon our industrial system would greatly increase the elements of disturbance. Whilst many gentlemen are agitating the policy of abandoning protection in the United States, the people of Great Britain are very seriously discussing the propriety of abandoning the free-trade policy and adopting a different system. Nothing that we can do or say will influence their action upon this question. They will take such course as they think will serve their own interests. We must do the same.

It has been only six years since the farmers of Iowa, so prosperous under protection and the gold standard, were laboring under very adverse circumstances.

They well remember their situation at that time; and, although they might be disposed to favor changes, they will not grow enthusiastic over the transfer of their present prosperity to their neighbors in Canada.

This generation knows now that the American people can not afford to give away their markets to the foreigner in the hope of bettering their condition at home. [Applause.]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining on my side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has twenty-six minutes remaining.

Mr. HULL. I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, of course it is perfectly manifest that I did not intend to make any remarks on the tariff or any other question when I came into the House a few moments ago, but I listened, as I always listen, with great pleasure to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I have also listened during the past few days to gentlemen on this side of the House who spoke on a subject which, it seems to me, will bear a little study and a little thought, and that is the question of the present prosperity of the country. It is always easy to prove anything from figures, but I have been giving some considerable thought, for purposes of my own, during the past few weeks to this particular question, and I think that perhaps the figures that I have taken in a general way might be profitable to the House.

I recognize the truth of the statements made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] in regard to the wage and factory conditions of New England at the present time and I admit them frankly and fully and freely, but there is a reason for it; and without any partisanship whatever I think the Members of the House are entitled to that reason. I find that during the past five years since 1898, when we declared war upon Spain, to 1903 we had expended in excess of the five years immediately preceding \$818,903,236 in this country, almost entirely war expenses. When I first made that comparison I said to myself, "It will never do, it will never be safe for me to make that statement on the floor of the House, because our Democratic friends will say that it is Republican extravagance."

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Government has expended that sum?

Mr. HILL. I do; and just exactly what I supposed would happen has happened now, and that is that our Democratic friends would say it was Republican extravagance. Consequently I went back and made a comparison with the preceding years under a Democratic Administration, and I find that the increase, deducting the war expenses was probably not as great as the increase of the expenses during the Administration of Grover Cleveland over the preceding Administration of Mr. Harrison, which in time of peace was \$195,806,024; so we will eliminate that part of it from this discussion. But, as an industrial fact, we have expended probably seven or eight hundred million dollars in military, naval, and war expenses during these years.

We have also had another factor which has entered into the industrial problem, and that is this: That during these same years the British Government was engaged in a war in South Africa and they bought largely of their supplies in this country. I made those comparisons, and I find that during the three years of the Boer war we shipped to England and to South Africa \$203,980,118 more of our products than we had in the preceding three years, so that during the past six or seven years the industries of this country have been stimulated to the extent of more than a thousand millions of dollars, all of which stopped last year when there came the declaration of peace between Great Britain and her op-

ponent and the discontinuance of our war with Spain and the reduction of our military and naval expenses due to the Philippine insurrection.

Now, as business men, is it not a reasonable proposition that there should be a slackening up of the manufacturing industries of this country under those circumstances? Where would it strike? Why, where the factories are, in New England, and it does strike there and it hurts, and it will continue to hurt until this country grows up to the capacity of the manufacturing industries of the country by a natural and normal growth.

Now, is there any further evidence of that fact? There can be no question about it. I took the clearing-house exchanges of the United States; and anyone who will refer to the last report of the Comptroller will find this condition of things: There was a falling off in 1903 of \$1,823,361,085 as compared with the year before—the business showing \$114,068,837,569 during the last year, against \$115,892,198,634 the year before. Where did this falling off happen? The figures will show how easy it is to prove either side of a case. I found that there had been a falling off in New York and New England to the amount of \$4,176,747,328, and enough increase in the rest of the country to make up for \$2,353,386,263 of that, so that the falling off, on the whole, was about \$2,000,000,000.

I found that the bank loan accounts, which mark the business conditions of the country just as accurately as a thermometer marks the variations of the weather, showed that there has been a falling off in New England of about 3.9 per cent, while there has been an increase of about 4.1 per cent in the Eastern States, an increase of 6.6 per cent in the Middle West, an increase of 10.7 per cent in the Western States, an increase of 17.5 per cent in the Southern States, and an increase of 37.1 per cent on the Pacific coast. That is your business situation. In order to prove to-day an absolute prosperity in this country surpassing anything before in the world, the San Francisco man has only to point to the condition of things out there, and the Southern man, with cotton at 15 cents per pound, has only to refer to that fact to prove to us the prosperity there.

On the other hand, if you want to prove adversity due to dull times in manufacturing (and it is true that there is much depression), then go up to New England and cite wage reduction there and the dullness in the factories, just as the gentleman from Mississippi has done. So that it is perfectly easy to prove any condition of things that you might want to prove in this great, magnificent country of ours.

Business has slackened up in New England, but we are able to live. We shall pull through there even with dull times; we shall come out all right; gentlemen need not have any anxiety on that score.

A MEMBER. And the depression is not due to the tariff.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. No. During all this session I have listened at times to the remarks made by our Democratic friends on the other side as to the effect of the tariff on our situation. They have told us that we could not have any export trade under a high protective tariff or under any protective tariff. The gentleman from Mississippi has discussed to-day the question of a protective tariff, and he says—I do not remember his exact language—that the tariff is high enough now to protect all the industries of the country. The question is not how high is your tariff, it is whether your tariff is put on according to free-trade principles or protection principles. That is the question.

The gentleman says that we can not have an export trade satisfactory to this country under the Dingley tariff. I have picked up some more figures on that, which I commend to the consideration of our friends. During the seven years of the Dingley tariff bill, gentlemen, I will show what the exports have been as compared with the seven years preceding, which included three years of the Wilson tariff. They were \$2,991,069,830 in excess of the preceding seven years. "Oh, but," some of our friends will say, "this is because of the high price for agricultural products, and that makes the difference." Not at all.

Limiting it to manufactured products only, during the past seven years, under the Dingley tariff bill, and comparing it with the manufactured products only exported during the preceding seven years, we find an increase of more than a hundred per cent of exported manufactures; and that, I will say to my friend from Minnesota, means \$1,333,200,208 exported over and above the preceding seven years before the Dingley tariff bill was enacted.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will.

Mr. LIND. And I ask this simply to place certain information before the House which I think is important. Is it not a fact that both copper and oil—that is, the Standard Oil product—are included in the schedule of manufactures?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Why, certainly.

Mr. LIND. And that the aggregate is upward of \$200,000,000 a year?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Well, I am perfectly willing to take that out.

Mr. LIND. The gentleman is using his statistics so fairly that the whole truth ought to be before the House—not for any partisan purpose. Is it not also true that if you eliminate the two items of oil and oil products and copper and copper products there has been no substantial increase in the exports of manufactured goods from the United States in the last hundred years—by percentage?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Well, now, I submit this: I listened to the gentleman the other day when he made his speech. I had never met him before, and I thought so well of him when he made his speech that I introduced myself, so that I might enjoy his acquaintance; but when you take this proposition do you believe—

Mr. LIND. I said by percentage.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Do you believe that one single manufactured product which you have referred to—oil or copper, or the products of either alone—would amount in seven years to \$1,333,000,000? [Applause.]

Mr. LIND. Not at all. I am afraid that the gentleman has misapprehended my question. I say by percentage. If you will pardon me just one moment, what I mean is this: Eliminate these two comparatively recent products of the United States, which are to my mind more properly to be classified as mining products, this remarkable fact is true—the relation between the exports of our agricultural products and manufactured products has remained almost constant for the last hundred years.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I will answer the gentleman on that point, and I say that after eliminating oil and oil products and copper and copper products, and taking as a test of the Dingley tariff bill the highest schedule in it, and that is iron and steel, I will give him the figures on that.

Mr. LIND. I did not make it for any partisan purpose.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In this one schedule the exports in the past three years have been \$337,785,430, as against \$130,659,738 under the Wilson bill, showing an increase in the last three years of exports in the highest scheduled item under the Dingley tariff of \$207,125,692, a gain of 158 per cent. [Applause.] Does not that answer the gentleman's question?

We have increased in 1903, as compared with 1893, in our exports to all Europe 53 per cent; we have increased in our exports to France 65 per cent, to Germany 125 per cent, to the Netherlands 100 per cent, and to Great Britain 25 per cent. I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi. What he stated about the slackening in the industries of New England might equally have been applied, and with better results, to the free-trade country of Great Britain. We find, even under the liquidating process always resulting from a great war, our exports to Great Britain have increased 25 per cent.

Now, gentlemen, the whole question of the tariff simmers itself right down to this: Who are the people of this country who are proposing to fix the tariff rates and provide for its industrial policy? They are the men who are interested in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I wish I had five minutes more.

Mr. HULL. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. They are the men who are interested in it. How is business done in this Congress? You know as well as I that it is not done as it is in the legislative halls in the various States of the Union, where every proposition brought in is reported and voted on—reported "yes" or "no" by the committee. It is done here by a great big machine and is done in accordance with the policy of the country, and you gentlemen, every one of you, sitting in your committee rooms know what is the result when bills are brought in that are not in accordance with that policy. They go to the waste basket, and that which the great big machine of the General Government, not what the individual wishes, prescribes shall be done is done.

Now, who are the men who are to do it under that system here? Let me give you the composition of the Ways and Means Committee to-day and what the membership represents, not with any sectional feeling whatever, but with reference to the proposition that the majority in this country ought to govern, and if that is not good Democratic doctrine, then I do not know what is. Now, think of the majority membership as represented by this committee when you talk about changing the policy of this Government. What would be the effect of it? The distinguished and able gentleman from Mississippi would take the head of the table on the Ways and Means Committee and the Democratic machine would dictate the policy of this country.

Now, what do they represent in the industrial system of this country. He represents 1,433 votes cast in the last election. There are more manufactured products in my district than are represented by the whole Democratic membership on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do.

Mr. CLARK. How many votes are cast in your district?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. More than any other member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CLARK. How many?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Forty-five thousand or more.

Mr. CLARK. Forty-six thousand were cast in my own. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I have the gentleman's vote here. As reported by the Congressional Directory, the gentleman had 33,361 votes cast for him.

Mr. CLARK. Who made that book up?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I do not know; I suppose the gentleman made that part of it himself. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK. What has that got to do with it?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In the district which I have the honor to represent there were 45,033 votes cast.

Mr. CLARK. How many people are in your district?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. About 250,000. How many in yours?

Mr. CLARK. Why did you not redistrict that State?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Because we did not choose to. We believe in self-government and that we have the right to do what we please within the law.

Mr. CLARK. That is exactly what you do not have, precisely.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Now, I want to show where the majority of the industrial portion of this country is found. The district which the gentleman from Mississippi represents has industrial products to the amount of \$5,565,662. The single city which Mr. BOUTELL has the honor to represent has industrial products to the amount of \$888,000,000.

Think of it; and yet these gentlemen propose that this great country of ours shall turn over the whole magnificent industrial system of this country to the care of people who do not represent it. Will they do it? I think not.

I will have to state my views further at some future time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to put into the RECORD and ask the Clerk to read the following document which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read a portion of the document printed below.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the rest of that document printed in the RECORD. I will not ask for the reading of the whole of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his remarks in the RECORD may be extended by inserting the whole of the matter which has not been read by the Clerk. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The document referred to is as follows:

MORTON HOUSE, New York, January 3, 1904.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

DEAR SIR: The "Medal of Honor Legion," of New York City and vicinity, at their meeting on the 9th day of January, 1904, unanimously passed the following preamble and resolutions, offered by Companion Peter F. Rafferty:

At a regular meeting of the Congressional Medal of Honor Association, of New York City and vicinity, held at the Morton House, Fourteenth street and Broadway, New York City, on the 9th day of January, 1904, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas Hon. BOIES PENROSE, Senator from Pennsylvania, has introduced in the Senate of the United States and Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, Congressman from Kansas, has introduced in the House a bill to place all soldiers who have received a medal of honor from the Congress for gallantry on the field of battle on a service-pension roll of \$75 per month: Therefore be it

Resolved, That recognizing the distinguished services our companions rendered on the field of battle, endangering their lives in bravely risking the same and performing acts of heroism outside of the line of their duty in the rank and file, and also mindful of the fact that nearly all of our companions have reached the age of 60 years, and also that other countries reward their heroes by some substantial token of testimonial for similar acts we hereby cordially and earnestly approve of said bill, and we respectfully ask you to report House bill 6477 or Senate bill 972 and place the same on the Calendar.

Yours, respectfully,

JAMES W. WEBB,

President Medal of Honor Legion.

PETER F. RAFFERTY, Secretary, 207 Second avenue.

Senator BOIES PENROSE, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill in the Senate (No. 972) and Congressman CHARLES CURTIS, of Kansas, in the House (House bill 6477) to place upon the service-pension roll at the rate of \$75 per month, in lieu of any other pension, all officers and enlisted soldiers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, both regular and volunteer, who have been awarded "medals of honor" or who may hereafter be awarded such medals, under acts of Congress passed December 31, 1861, July 12 and 16, 1862, and March 3, 1863, who have reached the age of 60 years. This age limit is not to exclude any officer or enlisted man who served during the rebellion of 1861 to 1865.

My companions, who won this medal, received it from Congress for conspicuous and particular gallantry and bravery, beyond the line of duty required of them during their term of service; such as saving the life of a wounded comrade who fell under fire between the lines, capturing the enemy's colors or saving our own, saving a gun or a battery, a company or regiment of infantry or some command, or leading a charge under particularly perilous

and dangerous circumstances, and such like affairs in the face of destruction and almost certain death. It is now over forty years since these brave and gallant heroes performed their various acts of heroism and valor, and at a time when they were young men in health, vigor, and activity, and now when they are old and fast becoming aged, feeble, and decrepit, and will soon answer the last roll call. It is but simple justice that these heroes of heroes (for all who served at the front in those days and received an honorable discharge are heroes, whether in addition thereto they received "medals of honor" or not) should also receive from the Government they helped to save something of value, more than a mere medal, to help them in their declining years. This is not mere sentiment, as some may imagine. The sum specified in this bill is not intended for either the poor or the disabled veteran; such is neither the intent nor the object of the bill, for in that respect our Government is most liberal to its soldiers in its various pension bills; neither is the Medal of Honor Legion composed of officers and privates by distinction of former rank; there are no generals or officers in that order as such, and there is no distinction as to or disparity of rank, but, on the contrary, one might almost say that in that order the privates command the generals.

Therefore, inasmuch as Congress has conferred special honor upon those wearing the "Medal of honor" for their deeds of heroism and bravery, such as have challenged and commanded the admiration of the world, would it not be but a fit and proper recognition of a grateful and generous nation now, at this time, when in the natural course of events these brave and gallant heroes, "bravest of the brave," can not be with us much longer, to also attach to their medal or give them something of real substantial value, the same as other countries have in a double or twofold manner done for their officers and soldiers who have distinguished themselves in like manner? Other nations have set us the example, as I proceed to show.

In the Congressional Library, in Washington, can be found a book on "Knighthood," from which the following is extracted, showing the manner in which deeds of valor and heroism are rewarded in other countries of the civilized world.

ENGLAND.

The Victoria Cross was instituted January 29, 1856, by royal warrant. This cross is only awarded to such officers or soldiers who have performed some signal act of valor or bravery in the presence of the enemy, and every officer or soldier who has received the cross shall, from the date of the act by which the decoration has been gained, be entitled to a special pension of £10 a year.

FRANCE.

The order of Legion of Honor was instituted April 19, 1807. The military class was admitted to the decoration, together with a pension to all who suffered amputation in consequence of wounds received in action, and are entitled to receive 100 francs for life in addition to their regular pay.

ITALY.

King Charles instituted on the 29th day of March, 1833, for the army and navy, a decoration consisting of a gold and silver medal, in addition to which a pension is attached of 100 lire for the gold and 50 lire for the silver. Both medal and pension pass to the widow of the deceased owner as long as she remains single, or to his children until they pass their fifteenth year.

GERMANY.

The Order of the Iron Cross was instituted March 10, 1813, by Frederick William III. It is divided into two classes—civil and military.

By decree dated August 3, 1841, a pension for life was granted to the surviving owners of the cross as follows: To officers, 150 thalers (\$22 10s.); to privates, 50 thalers (\$7 10s.).

There is also a military order of merit. This order was founded by Duke Eugene of Wurttemberg on February 11, 1759, as a reward for those officers and men who have distinguished themselves in the seven years' war then just ended. The members are divided into four classes, according to rank and degree of merit, and pensioned as follows: First, 2,000 florins; second, 1,200 florins; third, 1,000 florins; fourth, 300 florins.

SPAIN.

The military order of merit was founded by St. Ferdinand. It was made accessible to all military persons whose distinction and merit were testified to by a commission of inquiry which was instituted for that purpose.

Pensions are granted as follows:

Division generals.....	15,000
Brigadier-generals.....	12,000
Captain-generals.....	6,000
Subalterns.....	1,005
Privates.....	750

RUSSIA.

The military order of St. George was instituted in 1807 by Emperor Alexander as a reward for those officers and men who had distinguished themselves in battle. An additional pay of one-third is allowed to those who wear the cross.

AUSTRIA.

The military order of merit was founded by Emperor Joseph II as a reward to officers and privates. It is divided into gold and silver medals according to the respective degree of merit or distinction.

To the first is attached an increase of pay of 50 per cent. Thus we see that nearly every other country rewards its heroes who have particularly distinguished themselves for gallantry and bravery on the field, first by a cross or medal, and second by increased pay or an emolument in addition in the shape of money, and thus we see further that it is considered no disgrace, neither is it begging, for "medal of honor" men in this country to favor this bill and urge its passage.

Yours, etc.,

J. C. JULIUS LANGBEIN,
303 Broadway, New York City.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, how much time has this side remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has fifty-two minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I yield that time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation of the courtesy of the gentleman from Virginia, but it is hardly fair for me, under the circumstances, to take up the time of the House. I had the misfortune to be out when the eminent gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] who just took his seat delivered the larger portion of his address, and I only listened to the latter

part of it. In that he made a statement which I desire to correct, or, at least, I desire that it shall not go into the RECORD unchallenged. He made the assertion that those who advocate freer trade relations with Canada proposed to sacrifice the interests of the American farmer in that behalf. Now, I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that no thought could be farther from me than the one suggested, and that is true, I believe, of every citizen in my district and in my State who feels on this question as I do, as well as of this side of the House.

The gentleman from Connecticut who just took his seat accused this side of the House of being the representatives of the farming interests and the planting interests rather than of the industrial. In a measure I think that is true, although I do not apologize for saying that I represent as large industrial interests for a single district as any other gentleman in this House, at least in number of establishments and value of products, if not in the amount of capital employed. But if it is true that the agricultural and producing interests of the country other than the industrial are more largely represented on this side of the House, is it not strange that we and that I should plead for a policy, or ask for the adoption of a policy, that is directly detrimental to those interests? Does the gentleman really think that we are so shortsighted?

In regard to the interests of the farmers of Iowa and Minnesota in this question that I occupied the time of the House in discussing more fully a short time ago, I want to call the attention of my friend from Iowa to the fact that last year we sold corn—and I believe some corn is raised in Iowa—we sold corn in Canada to the amount of upward of \$3,000,000. We profited by it and Canada profited by it. We sold other agricultural products in Canada aggregating, I think, upward of \$16,000,000, very nearly as much as Canada sold us. The truth of the matter is that in the great staples exported by the United States, as well as Canada, there can be no conflict. Canada exports wheat; we export wheat.

If there is free trade between Canada and the United States, it can neither prejudice Canada nor us. Locally it may affect interests beneficially, or possibly adversely, but in the great aggregate it can make no difference and have no effect except to further the trade and profit of both countries. That is true of corn, because if Canada imports corn from the United States we send less to Europe, and our farmers sell it there because it pays them better than to ship to Europe. They may possibly export a little more barley or a little more oats than they would if they imported no corn, but we profit by selling that corn and they profit by selling the substitute abroad.

So, in the matter of agricultural products, when both countries are large exporters, it can make no difference if the natural products are on the free list. Now, as I stated, and I need hardly repeat it, I come from an agricultural State—I have grown up in it; my interests are wrapped up in that State and its future and in its agricultural progress and prosperity. Our industries are great; our commerce is growing; but it is agriculture that is the foundation, the corner stone, of our wonderful growth.

I say to you candidly, not in a partisan spirit, but in a spirit of true patriotism as I conceive it, that our farmers would be benefited. Now, instead of permitting partisan predilections and arguments to govern us all the time, let us look the facts squarely in the face. My friend from Iowa knows that he gets his strawberries in March from Mississippi; in April he gets them from Tennessee or Arkansas, and a little later from southern Illinois, and along in June from his own garden. Later he gets them from Minnesota.

That is true of other fruits, it is true of vegetables, it is true of a thousand—not a thousand, but scores of commodities that I might mention. Now, is there any good reason, I ask you in all candor and fairness, why that natural trade, depending upon the movement of the sun north and south, should not be permitted among people speaking the same language and having substantially the same ideals? Why should not the Canucks have an opportunity to exchange their Irish potatoes for our sweet potatoes, and their furs and an occasional fish, if they please, and some of their lumber and raw materials that they produce so readily but are not prepared to manufacture, for some of those things which we produce and that they can not produce? Such exchange, profitable to both sides, instead of being detrimental to the United States can not be other than beneficial to our people. It would be equally beneficial to the Canadians.

Now, if I am in error in this—it seems logical to me—I am willing to be interrupted and corrected. It is true that in localities the Canadians might send in some butter; they might send in some eggs and an occasional mutton and an occasional veal, say, into the State of New York. Supposing they do; their entire production is less than 2 per cent of ours. How can it destroy our market? It is absurd. Would not our profit in supplying their more numerous wants more than offset this? As compared to us Canada is a new country. A country industrially advanced like ours always profits in trade with a new country. Now, the gen-

tleman from Connecticut spoke so encouragingly of our growing foreign trade, I trust he did not construe my question as indicating that I doubted the accuracy of the statements, nor as inimical to that growing trade.

No one glories in American growth and development and prosperity any more than I do, abroad as well as at home. Let me say to him that to my mind the only justification that his great party has offered which will appeal to impartial men for the recent ventures of the United States in the far Orient, in the acquisition of the Philippines, for instance, is the trade that it will bring. We are spending to-day fifty to seventy-five, and I may be justified in saying, if you include all the direct and collateral expenses, possibly one hundred millions of dollars a year for that trade in the Orient. That trade in the aggregate amounts to less than the yearly natural products between Canada and the United States, a trade that costs us nothing, a trade that can be reached and carried on by the telephone, that can be carried on without armies, without vessels, that is carried on between kith and kin.

Now, isn't it wise—looking to the future, looking to the magnificent commerce that this new century has in store for this the greatest and most powerful nation in the world—to adopt a more liberal policy toward this magnificent domain to the north of us, controlled by people who, in fact, are our brothers, not merely our brethren? You can not deny it; you can not negative it in good reason. Why, here is a trade of nearly, yes, quite, \$200,000,000 a year, in which we have double the sales that the Canadians have.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] says we have that in spite of the tariff, we have that as things are, and that we ought to be content, and why ask for anything different. Yes; but why do we have it? We have it because Canada imposes a tariff of only from 20 to 25 per cent on our goods, whereas ours is double that. Their tariff is purely a revenue tariff, judging it by schedules and rates that prevail in the United States. It is because of that low tariff that we are enabled to trade as successfully as we do.

Supposing Canada—which she is very likely to do unless we meet her fairly—should increase her tariff to the same rates that prevail here. Do you think it would be a good thing for the United States? Do you think our exports to Canada would continue? Does my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] think that the electric bell would tinkle from the other side of the line calling for goods in those factories that he spoke about in his district, as it does now every day in the year, I apprehend? I venture to say that the gentleman's district sends more manufactured articles to Canada than to any other single nation in the world. Am I not correct?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I think not. I think we send more to England or to some of the European countries.

Mr. LIND. I doubt it. You do not deal in heavy iron products, do you?

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Not much.

Mr. LIND. If you deal principally in the lighter manufactures, then I venture to say I am absolutely correct in the statement, or rather the guess, that you send more to Canada of those smaller manufactures, higher industrial products, than you do to any other country in the world. Now, I say a trade of that kind is a profitable trade, and should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

Now, what I say I trust my good friend from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] will not construe as a criticism of anything that he has said, but I ask him in all candor, and I will be glad to have an answer, whether he thinks it would be a good thing for the United States if Chamberlain's policy, now pending for political discussion and possible adoption in Great Britain, should be adopted.

Mr. LACEY. As I understand, the gentleman inquires whether it would not be a good thing—

Mr. LIND. Whether it would be advantageous for the United States.

Mr. LACEY. What we may do will not influence what England may do. We shall have to do what is best for ourselves, and Mr. Chamberlain must do what he considers best for Great Britain.

Mr. LIND. That is not answering my question.

Mr. LACEY. I should think it would be a good thing for Canada if Great Britain would give her a preference in her markets. She is now giving Canada a preference of 33½ per cent.

Mr. LIND. Well, then, the gentleman concedes that it would be a good thing for Canada if England would give her preferential treatment and preferential duties on agricultural products, as Mr. Chamberlain proposes. Now, if it would be a good thing for Canada, and we being Canada's principal competitor in the English market, it would necessarily be a bad thing for us.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAY. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] desire further time?

Mr. LIND. Yes; a few moments only.

Mr. HAY. I yield the gentleman ten minutes more.

Mr. LIND. I say it would necessarily be a bad thing for us.

Now, when the conditions are such that we can absolutely circumvent Mr. Chamberlain's policy, as we can—we can make his scheme an impossibility and have an American union rather than an American-European union—we ought to do it. Without Canada Chamberlain's imperial trade union could not be considered for a moment. Without that vast food supply which Canada promises for the future, without that becoming a part and parcel of the Chamberlain scheme, it would be impracticable.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. LIND. Certainly.

Mr. LACEY. Does not the gentleman therefore come to the ultimate conclusion that the only way to have proper reciprocity with Canada is to have a commercial union, paying Canada a portion of the proceeds, and establishing absolute free trade between that country and the United States?

Mr. LIND. Not at all. You can not tell, nor can I—and I have given it very little thought—what the distant future may bring. Some day Canada and this great country of ours will be under one economic system. [Applause on the Democratic side.] God further the day! But that is not a practical question at this time.

We are separate governments. We must concede to Canada the right to impose a tariff for revenue purposes. That is their way of collecting taxes, as it is ours. We can not in reason ask them for free trade in manufactured products. But we can insist upon the same treatment that they accord England. England gives them a free market for their agricultural products. There is some ground for their giving England a preferential. If we extend the like free market to Canada (which we can do without sacrifice) we will be in the same position as England.

We can then say to Canada: "We insist that you give us the same preferential duties on manufactures that you have extended to Great Britain."

And I want to say to my friends here that that is the basis upon which I would favor free exchange of natural products. I think I have made my position clear on that subject. But if we do that and get the trade of Canada, it will be infinitely more beneficial to the United States, not at the expense of Canada, but because there are more people in the United States and a larger trade to be benefited.

We have 80,000,000 or more of people to be benefited by the larger trade and the larger opportunities, whereas Canada has only 5,000,000. It therefore stands to reason that the legislation and the policy which would be beneficial to both countries must be more largely beneficial to us.

I should deprecate the consummation of Chamberlain's scheme for imperial trade federation. I may not live to see the day, but I trust the time is not distant when our industrial, economic, and financial unity will be as extensive as the Monroe doctrine. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The Monroe doctrine includes the American Continent. We ought to be as potent financially, economically, and industrially as the Monroe doctrine is politically. Let our economic policy be as broad as the hopes, the ambition, and the aspirations of that great statesman, one of the greatest of American statesmen, James G. Blaine. He could only dream of an American policy. The time was not ripe for its realization. It is now within our grasp. These aspirations and hopes, as I have said on a former occasion, are not visionary. They rest upon the natural law that trade follows lines of longitude rather than of latitude.

I said then that the farmers of Iowa and Pennsylvania had very little to exchange, while the farmers of Arkansas and Iowa had much. The gentleman himself in the concluding remarks of his speech admitted the fact that trade was natural between the United States and Brazil. Yes; it is and always will be, because the sun establishes a difference of climate, conditions, and productions. So differences have always existed between Canada and the United States and always will. The permanent trade of the world has been between countries and regions having different climates and productions.

Consult the history of the great trade routes. The old caravan trail extended from central Asia, from the cold highlands of the central interior, down through Mesopotamia and Arabia across Egypt into Abyssinia and the equatorial forests of Africa. So on this continent, but instead of caravan trails it will be a way of iron extending from the Arctic Circle on the north to the Antarctic on the south, coextensive with our Monroe doctrine.

I repeat and I beg of you to forget mere local and temporary considerations in this larger aspiration, and deal with this question as Americans rather than as localized citizens of Michigan or Minnesota, as the case may be. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAY. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the first duty of organized society

is to preserve life; its next, to preserve property. I understand that five hours have been set apart for debate upon this bill. Five hours within which the 80,000,000 people represented here are to determine their attitude toward fourteen hundred other millions of people, to determine whether or not they will appropriate \$75,000,000, every dollar of which is a potential danger and may be made a coercive force to the fourteen hundred millions of other people on the surface of the earth.

The House spends days and weeks discussing whether Podunk and Squedunk shall have ten or twenty thousand dollar post-offices, and yet only five hours can be given to this question of civilization—the great question of what the attitude of this nation shall be toward the other great nations of the earth! But while five hours were set apart for debate upon this bill, only two of the many who have addressed the House during those hours have spoken on the subject-matter of this bill, even though it be fraught, as it is, with possible menace to the peace of the world. This bill is designated "A bill making appropriations for the support of the Army."

It should be designated "A bill to appropriate \$75,000,000 to increase the power of one strenuous man to get this country into possible conflict with one or more civilized nations." We have heard much during the past few months about the great interest the business men of the country, the "conservative" business men, are taking in the approaching Presidential campaign. We are told that many of them fear that the country may at any time become involved in a war with some other great nation because of the impetuosity of our great exponent of strenuousness, and yet have any of these business organizations raised their voice against this appropriation, a large part of which may, at any time, be used almost without notice in the very manner that they are said to oppose? So far as I know, not one. Yet they declare that it is their desire that the property and business of the country shall be conserved and preserved. And yet every one of them, as well as almost every man upon this floor, boasts that he is a "practical" man, but nevertheless asserts that "war is inevitable." I stand here to enter my protest against that unholy, un-Christian, unrighteous, and un-American idea. War is not inevitable. War is a relic of barbarism. To insist that it is inevitable is to assert that so-called civilized nations are yet barbarous.

Let me quote from one of the most distinguished men who ever presided over this House as to the inevitability of war:

Thomas B. Reed: "War is a beastly barbarism. It is only murder on a large scale with ranked battalions and pomp and circumstance. * * * Men have found by experience—which is another name for knowledge—that it does not pay in the long run to destroy property, and hereafter they will find out that it does not pay to destroy life." (Saturday Evening Post, 1900.)

Also the following, among the earlier Presidents:

IS MILITARISM A BOGY?

Thomas Jefferson: "Nor is it considered safe that a standing army be kept up in time of peace."

Andrew Jackson: "Our Government was instituted and is supported by the ballot box and not by the musket. A large standing army is not consistent with the spirit of our institutions nor the feelings of our countrymen, and the lessons of former days and those also of our own times show the danger as well as the enormous expense of these permanent and extensive military organizations."

Martin Van Buren: "It is not, however, compatible with the interests of the people to maintain in time of peace a regular force adequate to the defense of extensive frontiers."

That is, he opposed even an army required to garrison the frontier.

John Tyler: "Separated as we are from the countries of the Old World and in much unaffected by their policy, we are happily relieved from the necessity of maintaining large standing armies in times of peace."

James K. Polk: "It has never been our policy to maintain large standing armies in time of peace. They are contrary to the genius of our free institutions, would impose heavy burdens on the people, and be dangerous to public liberty."

Franklin Pierce: "The maintenance of large standing armies in our country would be not only dangerous but unnecessary."

When the American people, through their representatives here, appropriate \$75,000,000, what is their excuse? They say, to avert war. Gentlemen, so far from averting war, when you appropriate the sum this bill provides for, you are emulating those who advocate war in other nations. You are placing it in the power of one man in this country, as they do in one or a few men in theirs, to endanger the peace of the world.

In this bill you are doing here what is being done by every other so-called civilized nation, making immense appropriations providing that tens of thousands of men (in other countries hundreds of thousands) shall be engaged, not in useful occupations in the production of wealth for the benefit of mankind, but shall be engaged in the business of war. In this business of preparing to destroy your fellow-men you call yourselves "practical," and the people who support this policy call themselves "practical." In my judgment it is the most foolish and fatuous policy any so-called civilized nation can be engaged in.

The arbitrament of the sword for the settlement of disputes between nations is as foolish and even more wicked than the use

of force in individual disputes. Force and right are not synonymous, force as frequently being with the aggressor as the wronged.

For a nation to assert that its honor demands war is as wicked as for a bully to insist that his honor (?) requires some fancied slight or trivial injury to be wiped out with blood.

The modern exponent of force, the German Emperor, gets into a tremendous passion because the despoiled Chinese finally, in sheer desperation, takes a human life in the person of an ambassador; but his "honor" is not the least ruffled by the loss of thousands of lives in German coal mines, made needlessly hazardous by the greed of German coal monopolists. Nor is he disturbed over the degradation of German womanhood, which results from scores of thousands being hitched to the plow to take the places of horses withdrawn from cultivating the fields to carry his uhlans and draw his cannon.

"HONOR" AND THE PHILIPPINES.

The honor of Germany is made a cloak for the theft of China's immense coal deposits, said to be the greatest and believed to be the best in the world. Forty years ago England's honor required that she should force China at the cannon's mouth to open her ports to the demoralizing opium traffic.

To-day that same honor can only be satisfied by despoiling the Filipinos, the money already squandered by us in the attempt to subjugate those freedom-seeking people being ample to build a transcontinental railroad from one end of the country to the other, the building of which would do much to lessen the heavy burden that railroad monopoly lays upon the American people.

War can only be justified when waged in self-defense. As in all wars one of the parties is an aggressor, no war can be justified. Instead of every nation competing with every other nation in preparations for war, a union for peace should be formed to exert moral suasion upon any nation that showed a warlike intention.

How flimsy the excuse for war sometimes offered is shown in the case of the Boer war. Because British subjects were unable, under the naturalization laws of the Transvaal Republic, to turn themselves quickly into citizens of that country, the British Government made the demand for a change a *casus belli*.

Was ever such a preposterous demand made by one country of another? In effect, it was equivalent to saying, "You must increase the facilities for Englishmen to forswear allegiance to the country of their birth!" If there were a court of nations, as there are State and national courts, such a demand would be laughed out of court, if the country making it were not publicly reprimanded.

In this case, as in nearly all others, the real purpose of the war was not asserted. That purpose was the destruction of the Republic, so as to afford the means to appropriate its immensely valuable gold and diamond mines, the Beit's, Robinson's, and Rhodes's, and other exploiters objecting to the Transvaal as a nation participating, through taxation, in those great deposits.

The real purpose behind our war to subjugate the Filipinos is the same—the desire of a favored few to exploit its lands and its franchises. With us, as with England, the victims of domestic land monopoly are compelled to pay out of the meager earnings left to them by monopoly for the cost of this foreign land and franchise grabbing.

The Chinese imbroglio was nothing more than an attempt on the part of the so-called civilized countries to get ahead of one another in the great game of despoiling China of its valuable—actual or potential—natural resources.

WHO PAYS THE PIPER?

It is for such prizes as these that the patriotism of the American people, as well as those of other countries, must be kept pitched in a high key. A great army and a big navy are the necessary cards with which to play the game. But who pays the piper?

Even if the proceeds of these acts of spoliation were distributed on a per capita basis among the people it would still be robbery and equally indefensible. But the masses everywhere pay the cost; they supply the brawn and the cash, while the shrewd patriotic (?) exploiter "gobbles the loot."

We hear a great deal nowadays of arbitration, of peace gatherings, but at not one of them, so far as I know, has any practical step been proposed for even partial disarmament or partial reduction of the immense armies of the world or of their great navies. A small gathering, an unofficial gathering, of this body and the Senate took place in the lobby of this House the other night to discuss the formation of a group or committee to bring about international peace. All sorts of plans are proposed for entertaining members of other parliamentary bodies, for junketing trips, etc., for which an appropriation is to be asked, but no practical step is proposed or suggested to bring about international peace. And yet when I proposed what I regard as a practical step in that direction as embodied in these resolutions:

Whereas the conserving and not the destroying of human life is the first and most sacred duty of organized society; and

Whereas immense armies and great navies are as constant a menace to the peace of nations as the carrying of weapons by individuals is to the peace of communities; and

Whereas society has so far progressed that the resort to arms by individuals is no longer permitted, so the resort to war by so-called civilized countries should no longer be tolerated in the court of nations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this gathering of members of both Houses of Congress and of both parties that the United States should, as a practical step toward universal peace, formally call upon all the great nations of the world to disband one-half of their armies and dismantle half of their navies as they existed in the respective countries on January 1, 1904—

this to be a proposition from the American people to all the civilized nations of the world urging an immediate reduction of the present gigantic standing armies, etc., no other Member of this House at that gathering supported it or even gave it countenance.

A bill has been introduced in this House to appropriate the enormous sum of two and a half billion dollars to be expended during the next eighteen years in building a great navy. The Brooklyn Times of November 30 has an editorial on this proposition, headed "Seems a reasonable scheme." I will only quote one paragraph therefrom:

Two billion and a half dollars is a big sum to contemplate and to think of expending. When one reflects that the country will be called upon to expend the sum only in annual installments and comparatively small amounts—in sums that it can easily afford—the immensity of the scheme is dwarfed and really assumes reasonable proportions.

A reasonable scheme, forsooth! What is the reason that is given for such a proposition? What is the reason given for every naval appropriation bill upon this floor? It is that we have got to do it because other nations do it. Our so-called patriotic men get together into a navy league, headed in this country by an ex-Secretary of the Navy, and propose schemes for immense naval appropriations, a little less wild and insane, I admit, than this Hobson scheme, but nevertheless wildly insane. They insist that these immense sums must be appropriated because other nations are doing that very thing.

NAVY LEAGUES AT WORK.

Look at what is being done. In England a navy league exists, officered by various betitled and beribboned war gods. They base their plea to the British public for larger additions to the British navy upon the fact that other nations are going so.

"Look at Germany," they say. "She is spending a hundred or so million marks a year for battle ships and cruisers, and in five, seven, or some other number of years her fleet will equal ours. We must therefore go on and build more and faster vessels." Result, the heavily taxed British workingman is more heavily taxed, more thousands of able-bodied Britons are withdrawn from useful employment, more public debt created, and the nation goes on singing Britannia Rules the Waves.

Cross over to Germany, and there you see a German navy league at work distributing millions of pamphlets urging the need of a larger navy.

The German peasant and workingman are told that it is not enough that a great army exists to repel foreign invasion by land; the country needs a large and splendid navy to maintain its prestige as a "great world power!" A comprehensive policy providing for the construction each year of more large battle ships and cruisers must be carried out, because England, France, Russia, and the United States are making big additions to their respective navies.

The unsophisticated rural German is awed by the picture skillfully presented to him by navy-league patriots of a possible coalition of Russia and France, or of England and the United States, and votes for a big navy, with its great increase of tax burdens. Of course Russia doesn't even go through the form of asking the people's consent to these expenditures. She does it by executive direction.

OUR DESTINY.

So, not to be outdone in this game of "patriotism," a navy league is formed here, and we are told that "destiny" has made us a world power and we also must build a navy that shall be the envy of the world.

When the "destiny" cry gets a little overworked and the people become a trifle slow in appreciating their great opportunities as pioneers of civilization and buckshot, we are told that our insular possessions, stolen from a freedom-seeking people, must be protected; that great dangers, as well as great responsibilities, are a part of this destiny. Other great nations are rapidly increasing their naval strength and we must do likewise to maintain our position.

England is adding to her immense navy, Germany is building one, Russia and Japan are doing the same; therefore we must do likewise. Are we to fall behind in this glorious race for supremacy on the ocean?

Build, build, build! More battle ships, more and faster cruisers, more and speedier torpedo boats. Let the good work go on. What if it does cost a hundred millions, more or less, annually?

Isn't this a big country, the greatest on the face of the earth, bar none?

We can stand the expense; we are a country of billion-dollar Congresses now, and we must keep ahead of the procession. It is our destiny! Haven't we licked Spain? And can't we lick Germany, too, when we get a bigger navy? May we not have to lick England some day? And how are we going to do it without the biggest and finest navy in the world?

If these navy leaguers were not such boisterous patriots, so that their thinking apparatus could work for a moment, they might ask themselves, Where is all this to end?

Not a larger navy than Germany, for we must then go on and build one larger than England. Besides, this insane fever for "bigness" in a navy produces a corresponding desire for bigness among the Germans and the British; each acts and reacts upon the other.

When we build more efficient war vessels to destroy Englishmen or Germans their navy leaguers point to the number and size of our naval appropriations as a reason for more ships and larger appropriations by those countries.

So the ridiculous, insane, mad folly goes on. The more foolish we become in this strife for naval supremacy the more are European nations incited to the creation of even bigger navies than heretofore, no matter what the cost. Where is it to end? Where else can this fatuous policy lead us if not to a war with some other nation?

If the agitations of these navy leaguers were not inherently wicked, in that they incite a desire for wholesale killing of other peoples, their purpose would yet be the most stupid and illogical that men otherwise presumably sane could engage in.

Every squadron that leaves our shores has among its officers those who desire a war as a means for rapid advancement, to say nothing of prize money and loot. Removed from the direct observation of our citizens, every squadron sent abroad is fraught with dangers to the nation's peace that monarchies are not subjected to, as no potential Presidential candidates are treading the decks of English or German men-of-war anxious to create an opportunity to return as popular idols to high civic positions.

Was there ever anything so foolish or so insane? And yet the men who clamor for these immense appropriations "in order to get ready for war" boast of their level headedness and their "practicality." Ernest H. Crosby, who was appointed by President Harrison judge of the international court at Alexandria, Egypt, has, it seems to me, described this condition of mind very graphically.

Mr. Crosby says:

ERNEST CROSBY IN THE WHIM.

ROBERT BAKER, Congressman from Brooklyn, has been jumped upon by all classes of newspapers because he refused to name a candidate for the naval school at Annapolis, asserting as his reason that there is no excuse for training men in the art of murder.

He is no soft-hearted, effeminate sentimentalist, nor is he a man of defective logical powers, as these journals would have us believe. I have known him for years, and I know him to be a man of peculiarly keen observation and intellect. And the fact is that he told the simple truth. There is no excuse whatever for teaching our promising young men the best way of slaughtering their fellowmen. The idea that somebody might "attack" us is the product of an unbalanced brain.

There is a well-known disease (I think they call it "paranoia") which ends in softening of the brain and death, and which presents as its first symptom the belief that people are conspiring against the victim. A man of this kind came into my office some months ago thinking that I was practicing law and, after carefully shutting the door and looking around suspiciously to make sure that there was no spy present, he explained to me in whispers that he was pursued by conspirators and appealed to me for protection against them. I saw at once what the matter was, and I told him frankly that I believed that he was suffering from hallucination, and this belief of his was a common symptom of mental derangement.

He smiled at me in a patronizing way (precisely as our patriots do when I tell them the same thing) and assured me that he was well acquainted with the delusion to which I referred, but that his case was quite different. Seeing that I could make no impression upon him, and having no desire to add him to the list of my regular callers, I advised him to move to some other city, leaving no trace of his whereabouts behind, and especially not to let me know where he was going, and I have not heard from him since. An acquaintance of his told me afterwards that he was hopelessly insane.

ARMING AGAINST BURGLARS.

Now, our statesmen are suffering from this form of paranoia, but unfortunately it is not so easy to get rid of them. Nobody in the world is going to attack us. They may cite the fact that men usually have revolvers in their houses as a protection against burglars and that nations should take similar precautions. It would be easy to prove from the newspapers that the household revolver kills ten innocent people for every burglar, but let that go. The cases are absolutely dissimilar. We arm ourselves against burglars, but we do not arm ourselves against Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown who live next door and dine at our tables and sit opposite us at church.

Now, there are no burglar nations, but we actually arm ourselves as a nation against our friends and equals. Imagine a man setting up a battery along his neighbor's fence and practicing to find the range of his house, and yet pretending to be on good terms with him! The thing is of course ludicrous in the extreme and only explicable on the hypothesis of incipient insanity.

Mr. Root has been paying visits abroad, and he has been a guest at the country homes of English statesmen. He might have gone in the same way to the homes of the rulers of France and Germany. How he would have resented the imputation that Mr. Balfour or President Loubet or the German chancellor might be lying in ambush for him and preparing to kidnap him or

assassinate him! And yet when it is suggested that these same people as statesmen intend to "attack" us as a nation, at once we begin to pile up \$5,000,000 battle ships and beat the woods for recruits. Clearly, the whole thing is pathological.

And one of the most amusing arguments brought against the common-sense objections to this crazy militarism is that such objections are sentimental and that the militarists are stern, clear-sighted, matter-of-fact individuals, who meet real conditions with real businesslike wisdom, while the fact is that they are all daft with shadowy sentiment. Patriotism, Old Glory, the Union, the Army and Navy—they are ready to lose their heads over anything that can be written with a capital initial without ever once thinking of analyzing the truth and falsehood for which the epithet may stand. Patriotism, flags, unions, armies, and navies were made, like the Sabbath, for man, and to worship them as ends in themselves is sentimentalism run mad.

Mr. BAKER has been analyzing this navy fetish, and he has come to the conclusion, as every unprejudiced man must, that it is the focus of extravagance, pride, bluster, hatred, and murder, and that the sooner we are delivered from it the better. He may have the satisfaction of knowing that at some time in the dim future the rest of the world will catch up with him. Meanwhile, I doubt if the attacks made upon him by the whole lunatic asylum disturb him much.

The appropriation of this \$75,000,000 is, in my judgment, an insane act for this nation to be engaged in. As Mr. Crosby says, if anyone were to suggest that Mr. Balfour or some other man holding a responsible position in the British Government—one of those who entertained Mr. Root—were preparing to kidnap or assassinate him he would be called a crazy lunatic. Yet the Secretary of War goes over to England, is entertained there, comes back here and says in this bill, in effect, that we must get ready to fight the British nation; we must get ready to fight Germany, Russia, Italy, France, or any other nation, and yet he prides himself upon his sanity and his level headedness and his great practicality.

I suppose that if the war ministers of any of the great European nations were to visit the United States that they would be entertained by the Cabinet ministers, and possibly by the President, but on their return to their respective countries they would almost certainly continue their present preparations for war on a gigantic scale. I find in the New York American Yearbook that six great European nations during last year spent the following sums and had these men in their standing armies:

Country.	Soldiers.	Cost.
Austria-Hungary	361,000	\$59,000,000
France	518,000	143,000,000
Germany	600,000	128,745,000
Great Britain	542,000	454,000,000
Italy	278,000	47,000,000
Russia	1,042,000	242,000,000
Total	3,341,000	1,073,745,000

We are told that these are the armies on a "peace" footing, and that the number constituting the armies of these countries on a war footing would amount to over 13,000,000.

These same European nations (excluding Austria-Hungary) also spent last year, according to the London Daily Mail Yearbook, \$366,500,000 for their navies and had 305,700 men manning their war ships.

Country.	Men.	Cost.
France	53,500	\$62,500,000
Germany	33,500	64,000,000
Great Britain	127,000	172,500,000
Russia	65,000	54,000,000
Italy	26,700	23,500,000
Total	305,700	\$366,500,000

So it appears that nearly a billion and a half dollars was spent by these so-called "civilized" nations in preparations to fight each other, while there were some 3,650,000 adult males, all presumably able-bodied and in full possession of physical vigor, who were not merely nonproducers of wealth, but were enormously expensive consumers of the wealth produced by other workingmen.

While Russia thus, according to these authorities, spent the enormous sum of \$296,000,000 in training men for war and equipping them with powerful machinery to destroy human life, her expenditures for educational purposes the same year amounted to only \$22,000,000. Comment on this striking contrast between the gigantic preparations to destroy life as compared with the ridiculously inadequate appropriations to develop and broaden the intellect would be superfluous.

How completely this worshipping of the god of war takes possession of the human mind, to the exclusion of every humane instinct, was vividly revealed to me recently in a conversation with a retired commodore of the Navy. The Spanish war was a subject of particularly pleasing reminiscence, as it brought him again into service; but he was even more enthusiastic over the fact that that war had enabled a relative to gain an advancement which, as he said, "Had it not been for the war it would have taken him fifteen years to secure." In every other respect a good and kindly man, it needed the

merest cursory reference to the subject of war to so inflame him that he fairly gloated over the prospect of taking human life on a wholesale scale—the lives of human beings who, if we are to believe the precepts of the Savior of mankind, are made in the image of their Creator, and which ought to be held sacred above everything else.

The logic of this policy—if the term “logic” is applicable where such madness prevails—is for each of the great nations in their strife for supremacy to go on, ever increasing the size of their navies, until every adult male, not already enrolled as a soldier, shall be manning its ships. Those who in England oppose this folly are dubbed “Little Englanders;” here are called “un-American.”

And, yet these men are the truer patriots, as they urge each country to stand for the highest ideals of liberty and justice for all mankind, opposing bigness and bluster, with its accompanying enslavement of the weak.

There is no natural reason why the inhabitants of one country should wish to fly at the throat of the people of another country. There never would be war if the passions of the ignorant and heedless were not played upon by the shrewd and unscrupulous for purposes of personal aggrandizement, either of wealth or power. The beating of tomtoms at the slightest provocation and the ostentatious preparations for war by the rulers of great nations serve to kindle the passions of the masses to their own undoing.

I refuse to be a party to this shameful cruel game. On the contrary, I propose to exert whatever influence I can to the removal of the artificial barriers which unscrupulous greed in this, as in other countries, has erected to impede the free intercourse of nations. Unrestricted commerce is the world's most potent civilizer, and my efforts will be directed to making commerce with other nations as free as between the States of the Union, confident that the full fruition of that policy will put an end to war, with all its horrible attendant evils and the fearful suffering always entailed, and will usher in the era of the brotherhood of man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, to sum up the situation, General Sherman said, “War is hell.” It is hell, and it never will be anything else but hell. It is the duty of the American Congress to do all in their power not to create hell, not to add to the flames of that place, but to do all they can to see that peace, universal peace, peace throughout the whole world, shall be the policy of the great civilized nations.

Let us say to the world we will no longer go on with this foolish, vicious policy; we will no longer continue to appropriate these enormous amounts of money for instruments of wholesale slaughter. That we, the American people (occupying a unique, unassailable geographical position among the civilized nations of the world), propose to lead in a crusade not for war, but in a crusade which will bring about ultimate universal peace. A first step toward that much to be desired end is an agreement on the part of the civilized nations of the world to reduce their armaments, their armies, and their navies by at least 50 per cent as they existed on the 1st of January of this year. No nation can object to that proposition. No nation can say: “Had we known such a proposition as that was to be made we would have increased our army and navy in order to get ready to reduce,” because that is practically the argument that is always made when any proposition for a reduction for armament is made. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I desire to apologize to the House for taking any more time, but the gentleman from Minnesota asked a question which I should like to answer. It is as follows: “Do you think it would be for our best interest to have the Chamberlain policy carried out?” I will answer that by telling a story. Two years ago I stood on the deck of a Japanese liner in the harbor of Vladivostok, Siberia. In the hold of that ship was 700 tons of American agricultural implements that had come across the Pacific Ocean from America for the use of the peasants of Siberia. They came under the Dingley tariff bill.

Right over on the other side of the harbor was an English tramp ship loaded with American steel rails from Pennsylvania which had been shipped there to be used by the Siberian Railroad, and shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill.

That day I went ashore and at night at the hotel in Vladivostok I was introduced to a gentleman who told me that he represented the Baldwin Locomotive Works, of Philadelphia, and had just finished a contract by which he had put into operation on the Siberian Railroad 150 Baldwin locomotives, shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill.

The next day I rode 500 miles up to the Amur River over American steel rails shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill. The day following I got aboard the steamer to go up the Amur River 1,500 miles. It was a steel steamer and had in tow two steel barges, both made in Pittsburgh, Pa., sent there—12,000 miles, to the other side of the world—and shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill.

The first night out we wrecked one of these barges and the

freight had to be unloaded. There were all sorts of American products in that cargo of freight. Ten thousand miles from here, gentlemen, in the little Siberian village of Gorbitza, consisting of a dozen log houses, in a little store not over 8 by 10, we bought packages of candy wrapped up in paper on which was printed the picture of William McKinley to popularize that candy among the peasants of Siberia. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HILL. If my time can be extended. I have not yet answered the question of the gentleman from Minnesota. All the way across Asia my journey on the cars was made safe and pleasant by the Westinghouse air brake made in Pittsburgh, Pa., and shipped over there under the Dingley tariff bill.

The finest stores in all Europe—in Vienna, in Berlin, in Paris, and in London—are those which are selling American shoes shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill, and I say from personal knowledge in my own town that they are selling them at prices which are higher than they are sold at in the United States of America, all shipped there under the Dingley tariff bill.

I went to London and I called on a friend, an English gentleman who had been in charge of a transportation company in this country for thirteen years. I said to him, “How's business?”

“It is bad.”

“What is the matter?”

“Matter enough.”

“What is it?”

“Our ports,” he replied, “are wide open to you and yours are closed to us. If I had my way, I would put a duty on everything that comes from your country into Great Britain, and then I would have something to give to you in return for like concessions on your part.”

Now, that is the Chamberlain policy, and I want to ask my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] if, when he goes into a battle, he strips his armor off and hands it to his enemy? Would you by a Democratic policy put this country into the same position that England is when England is trying to get out of it in order to protect herself? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has two minutes and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] has seventeen minutes remaining.

Mr. HAY. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to enter upon any discussion of the tariff at this time; I desire to submit somewhat of arithmetic. When the gentleman from Connecticut was making his speech I was not listening very attentively. I thought he was stating the whole number of votes in his district. It so happened the other night I was figuring on the probable vote in my own district this year, if it was all cast, as it usually is in a Presidential year, and there will be over 46,000. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] undertook to take great glory to himself and the people in his district by saying 45,033 votes were cast for him in his district at the last election. That seems enormous.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I said there were 45,033 votes and that in the district of the gentleman from Missouri there were some 33,000 votes.

Mr. CLARK. Wait a moment. I misstated that. I did not do it intentionally. What he said was that there were 45,033 votes cast in his district, all told, in 1902. That seems enormous, being much larger than the average. How do you suppose there happened to be 45,000 votes cast in his district? Simply for the reason that they have never redistricted the State under the last census and apportionment, though gaining one Representative, and they elect one Representative at large and four by districts, so that the gentleman's district, if the State were redistricted, instead of having a population of 247,815 out of a total population of 908,420 in the State, would have 181,647 people in it.

Instead of representing partially one-fourth of the State—because Mr. LILEY represents all four districts as much as Mr. HILL represents his one—if the State were redistricted, as it should be, he would represent but one-fifth of the population of the State instead of a fourth; and he undertakes to draw the unfair inference here that there are more votes cast in his district in proportion to population than are cast in my district. Let us see how he comes out. He is not half as popular in his district as he would have you believe. [Laughter.]

In the First district of Connecticut Mr. HENRY received 37,744 votes, because it has a smaller population—only 220,003. In the Third district [Mr. BRANDEGEE's] there were 21,384 votes cast—population only 129,610. In the Fourth district, which is that of Brother HILL, there were 45,033 votes cast out of a population of 247,815. In Mr. SPERRY's district (the Second) there were 54,199 votes cast out of a population of 310,923, which makes Mr. SPERRY,